



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE DRAMATIC ART OF SOPHOCLES AS REVEALED BY THE FRAGMENTS OF THE LOST PLAYS

BY CHANDLER RATHFON POST

## I

THE edition of the *Fragments of Sophocles* brought out by A. C. Pearson in 1917<sup>1</sup> is so exhaustive in its scope, so profound in its erudition, so rich in new theories, and so sane in its conclusions that it may fairly be said to constitute as important a stage in the general endeavor to reconstruct the lost plays as the publication, in 1839, of F. G. Welcker's *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus geordnet*. The inclusion and elucidation of the fragments from the papyri and from the lately discovered beginning of the *Lexicon* of Photius<sup>2</sup> and the judicious discussion of the recent literature on the lost plays are in themselves important contributions. An estimate of the achievement of Sophocles may now be founded with more confidence upon a somewhat broader basis than the seven extant tragedies. The purpose of this article is to indicate certain respects in which our augmented knowledge of the other tragedies throws light upon one phase of his achievement, his dramatic art. It is, in part, merely an attempt to interpret and synthesize the results of others' investigation so far as they bear upon Sophocles as a master of the technique of tragedy. The discussion concerns itself largely with a verification, in the lost plays, of those principles of Sophoclean construction which I have sought to expound in a former article through a study of the surviving dramas;<sup>3</sup> but the wider vista, however broken and beclouded by the scarcity and vagueness of our information, has naturally brought into view other aspects of his art.

<sup>1</sup> A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Sophocles, edited with additional notes from the papers of Sir R. C. Jebb and Dr. W. G. Headlam*, three volumes, Cambridge University Press, 1917.

<sup>2</sup> R. Reitzenstein, *Der Anfang des Lexicons des Photios*, Leipzig, 1907.

<sup>3</sup> *The Dramatic Art of Sophocles*, in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XXIII (1912), pp. 71-127.

The categorical judgments that I have allowed myself are usually based upon the limited number of definitely established facts rather than upon the almost countless conjectures in regard to the substance of many of the plays. Often, however, it has appeared worth while to point out how one hypothesis accords with the Sophoclean method rather than another. In Pearson's as well as in previous attempts to recover the contents of the lost tragedies, too much stress has been laid upon such criteria as the relation of the Greek dramatists to the different mythographers or to the Latin adaptations, and not enough attention has been given to the question whether a possible version of a plot conforms to the general rules of composition observed by Sophocles in the plays that we are so fortunate as to possess intact. Undoubtedly, much might be ascertained by the latter process with a fair degree of surety, and, as a mere suggestion to future investigators, I have tried to indicate from this standpoint how several plots may have been manipulated by Sophocles. The result may often strike the reader as identical with arguing in a circle: it may seem that I have surmised the plot or some detail to be so and so on the ground of the usual method of Sophocles, and that then I have asserted the existence, in this reconstructed plot, of the very element of Sophocles' method which I have used in building up my hypothesis. An effort, however, has been made to avoid this pitfall, and in particular, to distinguish between speculation and conclusions from facts. Despite the new information afforded by the discovery of a section of the *Ichneutae*, it has been necessary to exclude all discussion of Sophocles' treatment of satyr-plays as a subject by itself.

## II

The topic that naturally first suggests itself for investigation, although the meagre material does not provide much direct evidence, is the way in which Sophocles changed and remodelled the mythical deposit, or varied from his rivals in its use, for the purpose of achieving his dramatic ideal of tragedy essentially based upon character.<sup>1</sup> It is

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of this principle in the extant plays, cf. my article on the *Dramatic Art of Sophocles*, Section I. Aristotle, in the sixth chapter of the *Poetics*, states that the chief concern of the tragic writer is the plot. He is outlining the general principles of tragedy and probably has in mind no special author; but if

interesting to remember in this connection that, of the two examples of tragedies of character adduced by Aristotle,<sup>1</sup> the *Phthiotides* was certainly by Sophocles, and the *Peleus* is in all probability the Sophoclean rather than the Euripidean play of that name. Unfortunately nothing is known of the *Phthiotides* and not much more of the *Peleus*.

his statements be taken on their face value without modifications or further analysis and explanation, I am obliged humbly to register my disagreement with the great "master of those who know." I do not believe, however, that Aristotle would exclude the possibility that a dramatist like Sophocles might think first of character in formulating his work. The plot is the principal thing in the sense that the essence of drama is action and that it is the action which manifests to the audience the ideas of the dramatist and of his personages. Aristotle definitely asserts that characterization is subordinate to action; but this assertion may be interpreted as meaning that the characters must reveal themselves through action and the vicissitudes of the plot and not through what later in the chapter, perhaps with this very point in mind, he calls *ρήσεις ἥθικάς*, bald speeches created only with a view to showing the personality of the figure in whose mouth they are placed. The characters are the cause, the action is the result; and the result is principal in the sense that it is only by action that the dramatist should declare himself to the audience. Aristotle himself says very much the same thing at the beginning of the discussion: *πέφυκεν δὲ αἰτίας δύο τῶν πράξεων εἶναι, διάνοιαν καὶ ἦθος*. My contention would be that Sophocles was more interested in the cause than in the result and that he even manipulated the mythical material and the plot so as to exhibit the qualities of his characters; but I should be the last to admit that he ever forgot that the medium through which he and his personages must express themselves was action. From this standpoint, even Sophocles himself would have maintained that the action or plot was the fundamental element in tragedy. Though the action is for him largely a "mode of holding up the mirror to human nature," he makes it, even in itself, thoroughly absorbing. Finally, for the sake of completeness, we may indulge in the hypothetical assumptions that Aristotle in Chapter VI meant literally to instruct the tragic writer under all circumstances to think first of his plot, that reference to Sophocles is comprised in the passage, and that I should be wrong to disagree with Aristotle, when so interpreted, in regard to this point: the pith of my thesis would still hold, for it could be shown that, even though the primary concern of Sophocles was with plot, he at least paid more attention to characterization than his rivals. (When in Chapter XVIII Aristotle mentions, as one of the four kinds of tragedy, that based upon character, he may be actually alluding to works, like those of Sophocles, in which the writer utilized the plot in order to give his figures bolder relief. The two examples that he cites are in all likelihood Sophoclean. In any case he has in mind tragedies where the springs of the action depended upon the traits of the characters more largely than in most instances.)

<sup>1</sup> *Poetics*, 18, 1456a1.

In one of his two plays<sup>1</sup> entitled *Athamas*, it is established that Sophocles chose for representation a less familiar part from the later history of the Theban monarch,<sup>2</sup> in which he was depicted as doing penance for his tragic sin, as finally saved, and probably purified. If we could still read the *Athamas* of Aeschylus, we might discover that Sophocles had taken from his predecessor the hint for the same kind of elaborate study of a redeemed old man that he embodied in the *Oedipus Coloneus*; but it is significant that Euripides in any case seems to have confined himself in the play that he composed upon this myth, the *Phrixus*,<sup>3</sup> to the earlier, livelier, and more complicated phase of the story that culminated in the flight of Phrixus and Helle. The possibility that Sophocles treated this earlier phase in the other *Athamas* or in his own *Phrixus* does not diminish the importance of the fact that at least in one of the dramas of the series he selected a chapter of the tale which must have relied for its appeal chiefly upon the subtle analysis of the protagonist's personality. Likewise, if we are right in concluding that the statement of the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius, I, 769, concerning a battle in the *Ἀθήναι* of Sophocles between the women and the Argonauts, refers to the action of the drama rather than to a narrative introduced into the drama, then Sophocles chose a section from the myth of Hypsipyle which would afford him the opportunity to depict the mental crisis in the protagonist, distraught between fear of the Argonauts, love of Jason, the knowledge of the concealed homicidal guilt of her feminine compatriots, and the imminence of the Argonauts' departure. Euripides, on the other hand, put upon the stage the much later episodes of Hypsipyle's performance of a Spanish fandango to amuse the ill-starred young Opheltēs, her rescue by Amphiaraus, and her recognition by her sons; and thus evolved a melodrama that the recently recovered fragments prove to have been as sensational a conglomeration as was to be expected from Aristophanes' frequent travesties in the *Frogs*.

<sup>1</sup> W. Dindorf (*Sophoclis Tragoediae Superstites et Perditarum Fragmenta*, Oxford, 1860, vol. VIII, p. 1) may be right in this case in explaining, after his usual fashion, the existence of two plays of the same name by the theory that one was only a revision of the other.

<sup>2</sup> Pearson, I, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> The second *Phrixus* by Euripides was probably a recension of the first: cf. Augustus Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Leipzig, 2 ed., 1889, p. 627.

As in the *Philoctetes* Sophocles introduced Neoptolemus partly for the sake of delineating the gradual triumph of his better over his worse nature, so there is very good ground for the belief<sup>1</sup> that in the *Teucer* he made the remarkable innovation of bringing Oileus, the father of the Locrian Ajax, upon the scene at Salamis in order to depict the effect upon character of a change from confidence in one's own well-being to despair at sudden disaster. Oileus was apparently conceived as first seeking to comfort Telamon at the announcement of the death of the greater Ajax and then as learning of the destruction of the Locrian Ajax. There can be little doubt that Cicero in the *Tusculan Disputations*<sup>2</sup> is referring to the *Teucer* when he says: 'Thus that same Oileus in Sophocles, who before had consoled Telamon for the death of Ajax, was broken when he heard about his own son.' There were other reasons, as always in a great author, for the novelty. The general dramatic effect must have been much heightened by thus bringing together not only the consequences of the sin of ὕβρις in two heroes named Ajax but likewise the grief of two parents. Sophocles also was able in this way to indulge himself in his characteristic desire to broaden the vista of a tragedy beyond the horizon of the principal myth concerned.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the evidence, cf. Pearson, II, p. 214 and under fr. 576 on p. 217.

<sup>2</sup> 3, 71. Cicero then proceeds to a free translation of the lines in Sophocles that describe Oileus' change of spirit. Stobaeus quotes the same lines but assigns them to the *Oedipus*. This attribution is, of course, a mistake, and it is generally thought that *Oedipus* is a slip for *Oileus*. The only two known plays of Sophocles in which there could have been such a juxtaposition of Telamon and Oileus are the *Teucer* and the *Locrian Ajax*. Unless we refuse to believe that, as so often happened in ancient quotations from the drama, Stobaeus substituted the name of a character for the proper title of the play, and unless we are thus forced into the virtually incredible supposition that Sophocles composed an otherwise unknown *Oileus*, the chain of evidence is complete that ascribes the meeting between Telamon and Oileus to one of the two above-mentioned tragedies. Since it is extremely unlikely that the greater episode of the death of the Telamonian Ajax would have been made subordinate by being introduced as secondary in the *Locrian Ajax*, all the probabilities are in favor of the *Teucer*. Even if for the sake of argument we suppose the contrary, the appearance of Telamon in the *Locrian Ajax* would have been as great a mythical innovation and would have had the same purpose of enabling Sophocles to depict the changing moods of Oileus.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. my article on the *Dramatic Art of Sophocles*, p. 122; and below, p. 60.

The most unmistakable instances of a transmutation of myth have to do with that interest in the delineation of the crafty Odysseus which is so marvellously evinced in the *Ajax* and the *Philoctetes*.<sup>1</sup> Whereas Euripides, in the *Iphigenia at Aulis*,<sup>2</sup> merely alludes to the agency of Odysseus in the plot against the heroine, Photius<sup>3</sup> definitely states that Sophocles introduced him as a character in his *Iphigenia*, which covered the same general ground. Apparently Sophocles here seized the opportunity for another study of Odysseus' worldly-wise personality: the Ithacan was probably instrumental in hoodwinking Clytaemnestra into acceding to the trumped-up marriage of her daughter with Achilles, and Welcker<sup>4</sup> surmises that he ensnared Achilles by first pretending to him that the marriage was real, so that the relation between these two characters would be analogous to that of Odysseus and Neoptolemus in the *Philoctetes*. If, as is altogether likely, the reference in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*<sup>5</sup> to a debate between Teucer and Odysseus in a play called *Teucer* may be assigned to the Sophoclean drama of that title, then Sophocles went out of his way to introduce Odysseus at Salamis, departing from the narrative of the *Odyssey*, which had represented him as pursuing a different course after the departure from Troy.<sup>6</sup> It is not at all probable that Sophocles was preceded in this radical innovation by the *Salaminian Women* of Aeschylus, which treated the same theme of Teucer's return but which is otherwise unknown to us. Even if Aeschylus was responsible for the invention, the fact that Sophocles followed him in such an extraordinary recasting of the myth would be significant of the fascination that the personality of Odysseus exercised upon him. The passage from Aristotle reveals that the son of Laertes no longer finds it in harmony with his canny philosophy to assume, as at the end of the *Ajax*, such a generous rôle as that of advocate of Teucer's petitions to bury his brother; he now sides with the old Telamon in his hostility towards Teucer and accuses the latter of having been "pro-Trojan." Other

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my article, pp. 92-94 and 121.

<sup>2</sup> *I. A.*, 107 (occurring in a passage of doubtful authenticity), 522 ff., and 1361 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Lex.* (ed. Porson), p. 410, 12.

<sup>4</sup> *I.*, p. 108. (The references to Welcker in this article are always to Volume I.)

<sup>5</sup> 3, 15, 1416b2 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Pearson, II, p. 215.

testimony to the manner in which Sophocles was obsessed by the character of Odysseus will be catalogued below.

Not infrequently the divergence from Euripides takes the form of a noble simplicity in contrast to such melodramatic, or, if one does not fancy the adjective, "romantic" complications as the old peasant's respect for Electra's chastity or the enticement of Clytaemnestra to Electra's hut by the pretence of childbirth. In the *Iphigenia* of Sophocles, Clytaemnestra and her daughter were probably lured to Aulis by an embassy of Odysseus and Talthybius (or Diomedes)<sup>1</sup>; Euripides summons them with a letter of Agamemnon and then adds the intricacy of a second intercepted letter of recantation, a device which doubtless is theatrically effective but is organically unnecessary. Sophocles apparently did not complicate his *Hermione*<sup>2</sup> by Euripides' insertion of the Andromache *motif*, or his *Meleager*<sup>3</sup> by Euripides' superimposition of the erotic *motif* of Atalanta.<sup>4</sup> On the ground of greater simplicity I should be disposed to agree with E. Thraemer's<sup>5</sup> interpretation of Telephus' discovery of his mother in the *Mysians* rather than with Welcker's,<sup>6</sup> K. Robert's,<sup>7</sup> and Pearson's<sup>8</sup> belief in the elaborate version, which later appears in Hyginus,<sup>9</sup> of a marriage with his mother and a theatrically averted incest. Although it was generally true that Sophocles was less complex than Euripides, the slight absolute knowledge that we possess about the former's *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος* does not of itself justify the conclusion of Wilamowitz<sup>10</sup> that such a relationship existed between this tragedy and the *Telephus* of Euripides, which treated the same later phase

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, I, p. 219.

<sup>2</sup> For the evidence upon the plot, cf. Pearson, I, pp. 141-143.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, II, pp. 65-66.

<sup>4</sup> For the *Meleager* of Euripides, cf. Nauck, *op. cit.*, p. 525, and for the Atalanta *motif*, frs. 521, 522, and 525.

<sup>5</sup> *Pergamos*, Leipzig, 1888, pp. 374-379.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 414-416.

<sup>7</sup> *Beiträge zur Erklärung des pergamenischen Telephos-Frieses*, *Jahrb. des Kais. Deut. Arch. Instituts*, II (1887), pp. 246-248.

<sup>8</sup> II, pp. 70-72.

<sup>9</sup> *Fab.* 100.

<sup>10</sup> W. Schubart and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Berliner Klassikertexte*, vol. v, *Griechische Dichterfragmente*, part II, *Lyrische und dramatische Fragmente*, Berlin, 1907, p. 71.



of that hero's life, his cure at the hands of Achilles. Wilamowitz argues further that the 'Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος, because of its supposed simplicity, was prior to the *Telephus*. Other reasons, however, will be adduced below<sup>1</sup> for the theory that the 'Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος was an early play, and these may be used as cumulative evidence in favor of the German scholar's contentions.

### III

In my former essay<sup>2</sup> I endeavored to show that the will of the protagonist, in Sophocles, is centered upon a definite object and that the drama is constructed of a series of episodes which serve the three-fold purpose of testing, punishing, and purifying that will. In some instances also the will of a secondary figure is put through certain ordeals. The system of testing is one phase of the conflict of wills that underlies all true drama. It is pertinent to discover how far this whole theory of Sophoclean architecture is confirmed by the lost tragedies. The theory implies the orthodox dogma of the "tragic sin." It is customary to define the tragic sin as the flaw in an essentially noble personality, the *ἁμαρτίαν τινά* of Aristotle;<sup>3</sup> and the system of punishment and purification of the will would apply peculiarly to tragedies admitting this interpretation. But the tragic sin may sometimes have been conceived as a definite misdeed or crime in the past, for which the protagonist is merely punished by the ordeals through which he passes and by the catastrophe; or there may have been a series of offenses. In such cases, the strength of will might be tested by the dramatic action; but although, as perhaps in the *Alcmaeon* of Sophocles, the play might include a formal, *ritualistic* purification from the stain of crime, and although the sufferings and punishment of the protagonist might be understood as a kind of purifying *penance*, yet no idea of a gradual purification from a constant defect of character would be necessarily involved. Among Sophocles' extant tragedies, however, those which take cognizance of definite transgressions exhibit also the persistence, in the protagonist's personality, of the fault that occasioned the misdeed or misdeeds; and if we possessed all of his writings intact, we might discover that such was always his practice.

<sup>1</sup> P. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 81 ff. and 98 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Poetics*, 13, 3, 1453a10.

Since many critics <sup>1</sup> doubt whether Sophocles was generally actuated by any conception of sin and purification, the inquiry takes on the nature of a polemic. H. F. Müller, in his book called *Die Tragödien des Sophokles*,<sup>2</sup> champions a keenly elaborated theory that in the extant dramas Sophocles has no intent of infusing moral elevation into his audience by the sight of a man punished for sin or slowly purified of sin but seeks rather a crushing and soul-shaking effect by the sight of a man engaged in a terrible conflict with the established authorities, with duty, or particularly with fate. The protagonist is not a victim of his fault. The tragic writer, Müller holds, does not concern himself with the question whether the will is good or bad. He is concerned only with the fact of a definite character and with the fact that this character expresses itself in certain deeds. The element of tragedy is sometimes found in the interference of fate to work the opposite of the protagonist's will and to pervert the outcome of these deeds into catastrophe, as when the impetuous search of Oedipus for the criminal unexpectedly results in the revelation of his own guilt, or when the gift of the garment that Deianira supposes to be a love-charm results in the death of her beloved. Müller finds the Aristotelian catharsis of the passions in the pity aroused by the vision of a mortal in the hands of fate and in the fear of the spectator that he himself may fall victim to a similar disaster. The audience is transported from the finite to the infinite by the contemplation of the inscrutable but ultimately beneficent workings of fate, and leaves the theater with the German equivalent of the catharsis, a *freies Wohlgefühl*. In certain respects Müller's interpretation and my own theory are in accord: he acknowledges that the will of the protagonist is directed to a definite end, and he does not expressly deny the existence of the protagonist's sin. The difficulty would be that Müller would refuse to accept the phrase "tragic sin," since his opinion is that Sophocles was not interested in guilt or innocence and that therefore there can be no idea of punishment or purification. It would not be my own wish to press the idea of punishment and purification too far. The *Antigone*,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my essay, p. 105, n. 4, where I have referred to the rejection of the tragic sin by the Wolff-Bellermann editions of the two Oedipus plays.

<sup>2</sup> Heidelberg, 1909.

*Electra*, and *Trachiniae* are delicate problems from this standpoint;<sup>1</sup> but the interpretation of these and of the other extant plays may be assisted by an honest effort to determine to how great a degree the general constructive system was employed in the lost tragedies. Inasmuch as I have limited myself to the framework of test, punishment, and purgation only in its bearing upon technical structure, it would not be relevant here to enter upon a discussion of Sophocles' conception of the essence of the tragic and of the catharsis of the passions.

Intimately involved with the question of the tragic sin is the problem of what may be called the "purificatory sequence." By this phrase I refer primarily to that relationship existing between two (or more) Sophoclean dramas which is illustrated by the manner in which the *Oedipus Coloneus* perfects the process of purification of character begun in the *Oedipus King*;<sup>2</sup> but the words may be applied loosely also to a series of plays in which is represented punishment for or ritualistic purification from a crime committed in an earlier member of the group, or in all of which are embodied the ordeals of a merely penitential purification from guilt. The extant tragedies do not afford further evidence for determining whether it was the common practice of Sophocles thus to compensate in part for abandoning the older custom of producing at the same time a trilogy of connected plays derived from the same myth. He often brought out in different years tragedies based on the various episodes of one long myth, but only the fragments and other data concerning the lost dramas can assist in an inquiry as to whether he maintained a sequence of thought or of development in any other tragedies of this kind besides the two *Oedipus* plays.<sup>3</sup> It is perhaps not absolutely necessary to assume that a tragedy exhibiting the final redemption of a character was produced subsequently to one embodying the earlier stages of the evolution, but probability is so much in favor of this assumption that the investigation has a direct bearing upon the chronology of Sophocles' works. If

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my article, p. 102. To the transgressions of Heracles there mentioned may be added the murder of Iphitus (cf. *Trachiniae*, 269 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. my article, pp. 106-108.

<sup>3</sup> If in a few instances Sophocles still produced trilogies of connected plays, he might have established a purificatory sequence through the whole trilogy instead of following his usual practice of establishing such a sequence in plays that were brought out at different times.

such purificatory sequences can be proved or at least inferred, they would constitute another instance of his desire for breadth of vista, which is illustrated in the extant dramas by the introduction of passages designed to transport the imagination of the spectator beyond the spatial and temporal limits of the actual scene.<sup>1</sup>

The information that may be gleaned in regard to the plays which continued the themes of any of the extant tragedies is too slight to provide much satisfaction. There is general agreement that, in the drama named after him, Teucer was represented as returning from Troy and as expelled by Telamon from Salamis because of the death of Ajax. The virtually certain fact that Odysseus in this play sought to thwart the sojourn of Teucer at Salamis<sup>2</sup> indicates that the will of the protagonist may have been focused upon remaining at his home and that the opposition of Odysseus was one of the tests that he had to encounter. Another would have been the hostility of his father. His will must have succumbed at last in order that he might emigrate to Cyprus, but this consummation may have been achieved, as in the *Philoctetes*,<sup>3</sup> only through the command of a *deus ex machina*, the appearance of whom in the *Teucer* is suggested by Pearson<sup>4</sup> on other grounds. No tragic sin of Teucer is discernible either in the latter part of the *Ajax* or in this tragedy, and therefore no process of continuing purification can be traced. The father, Telamon, who was evidently the deuteragonist, was probably conceived as subject to the common tragic defect of quickness to wrath, which Teucer in the *Ajax* incidentally ascribes to him.<sup>5</sup> The quotation of a line of the *Teucer* in the parabasis of the *Clouds*<sup>6</sup> would imply that in 423 B.C. its memory was still fresh in the minds of Aristophanes and his audience (unless the quotation belongs to the later revision of the comedy), and that therefore it was brought out at a later date than the *Ajax*.<sup>7</sup> Nothing is known of the third play of Sophocles drawn from this myth, the *Eurysaces*, except that in order to be honored in the title of the work the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. above, p. 5, especially n. 3.

<sup>4</sup> II, p. 216.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. above, p. 6.

<sup>5</sup> 1017-1018.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. my article, p. 85.

<sup>6</sup> 583.

<sup>7</sup> E. A. J. Ahrens (in the Didot publication of *Sophoclis Tragoediae et Perditarum Fragmenta*, 2d ed., Paris, 1864, p. 283) and Pearson (II, p. 214), however, would not be loath to date the *Teucer* before the *Ajax*.

son of Ajax must have been a prominent character and therefore grown to man's estate, so that the action would have been subsequent to that of the other two tragedies.

The title of the *Philoctetes at Troy* intimates that it comprised the events which are prophesied by Heracles in the extant *Philoctetes*<sup>1</sup> — the cure of the hero, his slaughter of Paris, and his assistance in the capture of Troy; but no hint exists as to the dramatic mode in which Sophocles treated the material. Since *Philoctetes* at the end of the extant tragedy has only begun to gain the mastery over his tragic defect of bitterness of spirit, there is every reason for believing that the lost tragedy, like the *Oedipus Coloneus*, traced the evolution to an ultimate victory over self.

It will subsequently appear that the *Aletes* perhaps formed a purificatory sequel to the *Electra*.

The other lost dramas may most conveniently be taken up in the Greek alphabetical order; but in cases where several plays are drawn from the same myth, all will be considered together under the letter of the play of the series that occurs first in the alphabetical arrangement.

In that one of the two *Athamas* tragedies which has already been discussed, punishment for sin is clearly to be discerned. The scholia on the *Clouds* of Aristophanes, 257, state that the protagonist was about to be sacrificed through the instrumentality of his first wife, Nephele, because of his crime against their children, Phrixus and Helle, but that he was saved by the announcement of Heracles that Phrixus was alive. The substance of the other *Athamas* and of the *Phrixus* is too doubtful to admit of any conclusions; but if either of them told the earlier tale of the attempted sacrifice of Phrixus by his father,<sup>2</sup> then the *Athamas* the substance of which is known would be the second member of a purificatory sequence.

No definite ancient statement exists as to the matter of the *Locrian Ajax*; but since the only vicissitudes of the hero's life that adapted themselves to dramatic treatment were his violation of Cassandra and his death in the storm that fell upon the Greeks returning from Troy, we are justified in conjecturing that Sophocles utilized one or both of these subjects. He probably emphasized the general tradition of

<sup>1</sup> 1423 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. above, p. 4.

antiquity that ascribed to the son of Oileus the sin of arrogance. Homer<sup>1</sup> gives as the reason for his destruction his scorn of divine assistance, and it is curious that Sophocles represented the other *Ajax* as cursed by precisely the same form of ὕβρις.<sup>2</sup> The desecration of Athena's image and the rape of Cassandra are further manifestations of this insolence, calling down the wrath of the virgin goddess upon him as upon the Telamonian Ajax, whose story Sophocles linked with that of the Locrian Ajax in several ways.<sup>3</sup> There were current tales, which the poet may well have coerced into service, of the final purification of Ajax, the son of Oileus, either through an exculpatory oath before a council of the Greeks or through an aetiological explanation of the yearly Locrian custom of sending two noble maidens to the service of the temple of Athena at Troy.<sup>4</sup> Two lines preserved for us by Stobaeus<sup>5</sup> seem to embody an explicit predication by Sophocles, as in the other *Ajax* play, of the tragic sin and its punishment:

τὸ χρῦσεον δὲ τᾶς Δίκας δέδορκεν  
ὄμμα, τὸν δ' ἄδικον ἀμείβεται.

The *Aegeus* probably treated the arrival of the youthful Theseus at Athens, the plot against him by Medea, who was living with Aegeus as wife or mistress, and his recognition by his father.<sup>6</sup> If, in opposition to Nauck,<sup>7</sup> we follow Pearson in assigning fragment 24<sup>8</sup> to this tragedy, as seems more natural, then the application of the demonstrative οὗτος and the adjective σκληρός to Pallas, the brother of Aegeus, indicates that Pallas was a character and that Sophocles put upon the stage the traditional opposition of Pallas and his sons to the sovereignty of Aegeus and Theseus. Pearson surmises that Theseus must have been sent to capture the Marathonian bull before he was recognized by his father. The ground for his surmise is apparently that, since the drama must have concluded with the recognition of Theseus and his acknowledgment as the heir, there was no place at the end for that capture of the bull which is plainly referred to in

<sup>1</sup> *Od.*, 4, 502 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Pearson, I, p. 9.

<sup>7</sup> 2 ed., p. 135.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. my article, p. 100.

<sup>5</sup> Pearson, fr. 12; Nauck, 11.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. above, p. 5.

<sup>6</sup> Pearson, I, pp. 15-16.

<sup>8</sup> N. 872. The references in this article are to the numbering of the fragments in Pearson; the numbers of Nauck are also given with the letter N. prefixed to the figure.

fragment 25.<sup>1</sup> The supposition would then be that Sophocles agreed with those writers who represented Theseus as despatched against the bull at the suggestion of Medea in the hope that he would thus meet his destruction. The *Aegeus* presents the first case in which such speculations as these tend to be corroborated by comparison with the general Sophoclean method. The data seem to point to the following scheme. The will of Aegeus would be focused upon maintaining the Athenian heritage for himself and for Theseus. This fixed purpose would be subjected to the tests of obstruction on the part of Pallas and his sons and of hostility on the part of Medea. Many details, of course, must remain obscure even to conjecture. Since Aegeus did not recognize his son until the end, his desire of securing Athens for his race must have been only general and not concentrated upon the unknown young man who had mysteriously appeared at court. As it was the custom of Sophocles to name a play after the person whose will was predominant,<sup>2</sup> all the tests ought to be applied to Aegeus; but it is hard to see how the adventure of the Marathonian bull and the culminating attempt to poison Theseus could have been such tests, particularly when Aegeus does not hold out but succumbs to the persuasion of Medea, himself sending Theseus on the commission of conquering the bull and presenting to him the envenomed cup. Perhaps, as in the *Antigone* and *Ajax*, the second part of the play consisted of tests of the deuteragonist's will, and the *motifs* of the bull and the poison were conceived as trials of Theseus. In any case, Aegeus would have achieved a triumph of the will at the *dénouement* when he recognized Theseus and showed himself finally obdurate to the machinations of Medea. The building of a play on a framework of tests was no iron-bound system with Sophocles, and appears in its perfection only in the *Electra* and the *Oedipus King*.

Of the dramas that Sophocles constructed from the episodes of the Perseus myth, the *Acrisius* and the *Danae* are unknown quantities. If, as has been conjectured, these titles were alternative descriptions of the same work, and if, therefore, the appearance of both Acrisius and Danae in the same tragedy narrows down our choice of subject to the story of the latter's divine *liaison*, the father may easily be imag-

<sup>1</sup> Since this fr. is from the new Photius, it is not included in Nauck.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. my article, p. 86, and below, pp. 44-46.

ined to have concentrated his efforts upon evading the oracle that foretold his death at the hands of his daughter's offspring and not to have shrunk from the last test of committing Danae and his grandson to the doubtful mercies of the waves. The tragic sin perhaps consisted in his constant resort to any means for the sake of furthering his end. The title *Danae* certainly suggests that Sophocles composed a play upon the early vicissitudes of the princess, unless one follows F. W. Wagner<sup>1</sup> in assigning the title to the material treated by Euripides in the *Dictys*, her later persecution in Seriphus by Polydectes. The development that I have indicated for the *Danae* tends to be corroborated by the probably similar structure of the one tragedy in the series of which the subject seems almost indubitable, the *Larissaei*. The name, for which *Acrisius* may again be a variant, and the fragments justify the belief that it had to do with the fulfilment of the oracle in the death of the old king at Larissa through the quoit of Perseus. On the assumption that Sophocles accepted the version of the tale which represented Acrisius as fleeing from Argos to escape his prophesied doom, his will would still have been directed towards averting his destiny, and he would have been so bent upon his purpose as to have swallowed the bitter pill of reconciliation with his grandson, since the reconciliation would naturally imply immunity from danger in that quarter. If Pearson<sup>2</sup> is right in interpreting fragment 378<sup>3</sup> to mean that Acrisius himself gave the games in honor of the restoration of domestic concord, then here would be another of Müller's interferences of fate. As the wilful search of Oedipus for the culprit eventually resulted in his own downfall, so the irrepressible desire of Acrisius for safety misled him into a reconciliation which fate perverted into the cause of his death.

The *Andromeda* belonged to the same myth but apparently not to the same sequence. With this play, we are on a bit of *terra firma* again, however small. The scientist Eratosthenes, writing as early as the third century B.C., states in his *Catasterismi*<sup>4</sup> that Sophocles represented at least one personage connected with the drama, the mother

<sup>1</sup> *Poetarum Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Warsaw, 1852, I, p. 198.

<sup>2</sup> II, p. 48.

<sup>3</sup> N. 348.

<sup>4</sup> A. Westermann, *Mythographi, Scriptores Poeticae Historiae Graeci*, Brunswick, 1843, pp. 250 and 263.



Cassiepea, as guilty of the Greek sin of ὕβρις, since she had dared to compare her own beauty to that of the Nereids and had thus brought upon her country the terrible visitation of the sea-monster. How this fact was worked into the scheme, it is impossible to determine. If E. Petersen's<sup>1</sup> explanation of a sentence in the sixteenth section of Eratosthenes is correct, she was introduced as a character sitting beside her fettered daughter. The suggestions of K. Wernicke<sup>2</sup> and Petersen,<sup>3</sup> that the gallantry of Perseus towards Andromeda was further balked after the deliverance by another suitor for her hand, are strengthened by the consideration that such an opposition would constitute just the kind of trial of the hero's will in which Sophocles delighted. Perseus was perhaps the protagonist; to achieve his purpose of marriage with the persecuted maiden he would have had to meet the two tests of the fight with the monster and the struggle with a rival. Possibly, although Petersen takes a contrary view,<sup>4</sup> there was also a conflict with the maiden's father, Cepheus, whom several versions of the story, notably the Euripidean, conceived as adverse to surrendering his daughter to her liberator. If Andromeda was the protagonist, she may have been represented as an heroic maiden, sacrificing herself willingly, like the Iphigenia of Euripides at Aulis, for the sake of her country. Her purpose would be tested by the terror of the dragon, but, like Iphigenia, she would be finally saved.

The *Aleadae* brings us to Sophocles' manipulation of the Telephus myth. It is fairly evident that his *Mysians* had to do with the second part of this story, relating Telephus' recognition of his mother at the court of Teuthras, and that he was here conceived as stained with that murder of his two uncles, the sons of King Aleos of Tegea, which was the theme of the *Aleadae*. Certain ancient allusions<sup>5</sup> to Telephus as suffering under a curse of enforced silence are generally referred to the play by Aeschylus, also entitled the *Mysians*, and perhaps Sophocles chose as the cause for the journey of Telephus to Mysia, not the oracle declaring that he should there learn the truth about his parentage, but the obligation to do a penance of exile for the double murder

<sup>1</sup> *Andromeda*, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXIV (1904), p. 109.

<sup>2</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, I, 2156.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 109.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 109.

<sup>5</sup> Nauck, *op. cit.*, under the *Musol* of Aeschylus.

that he had committed.<sup>1</sup> A papyrus fragment at Berlin proves beyond reasonable doubt that the 'Αχαιῶν σύλλογος embodied a still later phase of the history, the healing of Telephus by Achilles. According to the usual version, Telephus had been first wounded by Achilles because he had attacked the Greeks when they landed in Mysia and had actually killed Thersander, the son of Polynices. This fact, when brought into connection with his previous assassination of his uncles, would imply that the failing of Telephus was quickness to wrath. Such may have been his tragic sin in all three dramas. He could thus be compared to Oedipus, and the murder of the uncles in the *Aleadae* would correspond to the death of Laius, except that Telephus probably recognized his victims. If, as Welcker plausibly surmises,<sup>2</sup> fragment 85<sup>3</sup> of the *Aleadae* was spoken by Telephus at the height of his anger, then he himself was depicted by Sophocles as acknowledging, even at this moment, the impiety of his act.

It is hard to resist the temptation to make the scant data about the 'Αχαιῶν σύλλογος conform to one of Sophocles' schemes of composition. Inasmuch as Achilles does not seem to have joined the muster until the play had already begun, the first part was probably taken up with the arrival of Telephus. He can be imagined to have been intent on his cure, but, in order to achieve his desire, forced to overcome his old velleity to anger, now assuming the form of resentment against the Greeks. Before the commencement of the action he must have taken the first step in the victory over his ill temper by obeying the oracle that directed him to seek relief from Achilles who had wounded him. When he had reached Argos where the Greek host was gathered once again after eight years, his will, concentrated upon recovery from his wound, was perhaps represented in the first half of the play as subjected to a test or tests arising out of his lingering antipathy. Achilles too must have felt some animosity remaining from his former combat with Telephus, and the second part seems to have consisted of

<sup>1</sup> Pearson, II, p. 71. It is, of course, possible that the mother, Auge, was the protagonist of the *Mysians*. If we accept as Sophoclean the version of Hyginus that I am inclined to reject on account of its complication (cf. above, p. 7), the central *motif* would have been her constancy to her first lover, Heracles, and she would have carried her strength of purpose even to the point of planning to slay her new husband, whom she did not know to be her son.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 413.

<sup>3</sup> N. 82.

tests which were calculated to eradicate this rancor and which were finally successful. One of the tests to which Achilles had to submit was the persuasive eloquence of Odysseus. So reconstructed, the 'Αχαιῶν σύλλογος would be similar to the early tragedies of Sophocles, the *Antigone* and the *Ajax*, the first section being assigned to tests of the protagonist's will and the second to tests of the deuteragonist's will;<sup>1</sup> as in the *Antigone*, the deuteragonist, Achilles, would in the end yield to the pressure brought to bear upon him. On other grounds, Wilamowitz<sup>2</sup> dates the work before the corresponding *Telephus* of Euripides, which was produced in 438 B.C., three or four years after the *Antigone*. Although his argument itself does not seem to me to carry conviction, the scheme of dramatic architecture that I have outlined would tend to substantiate at least his chronological deduction.

The analogies between the Sophoclean characters of Telephus and Philoctetes are self-evident. They extend even to oracles demanding the coöperation of each, if Troy is to be taken, and to the resentment of both heroes as an obstacle to the design of fate. The cure of Telephus in the 'Αχαιῶν σύλλογος may have implied his final release from the tragic sin, so that this play might be construed as the last of another purificatory sequence, the earlier members of which would have been the *Aleadae* and the *Mysians*. If the *Mysians* really illustrated a stage in the purification, and if a chronological succession is also to be assumed, this tragedy must have preceded the 'Αχαιῶν σύλλογος and could not be dated, according to Robert's highly fanciful theory,<sup>3</sup> after 427 B.C.

The *Σύνδειπνοι*, on the supposition that the now prevalent ideas about it are correct, must have been very similar to the latter half of the 'Αχαιῶν σύλλογος. It had hitherto often been held that the two titles were alternative descriptions of the same play, but the publication of the Berlin papyrus of the 'Αχαιῶν σύλλογος turned the scale of evidence strongly in favor of a separation. Whereas there is at present every reason to believe that the 'Αχαιῶν σύλλογος had to do with the second muster of the Greeks at Argos, it is all but certain that the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my article, pp. 87 and 88.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. above, p. 8.

<sup>3</sup> K. Robert, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des pergamenischen Telephos-Frieses*, *Jahrb. des Kais. Deut. Arch. Instituts*, II (1887), p. 248.

*Σύνδαιπνοι* represented their stop at Tenedos and the refusal of Achilles to proceed on the expedition because he thought himself slighted in the invitations to the wassail there kept by the Hellenic chieftains. The chain of proof that the *Σύνδαιπνοι* was a distinct tragedy is not absolutely complete,<sup>1</sup> and, in order to apply to it the canons of the serious Sophoclean drama, it is also necessary to reject the less easily dismissed suggestion that it was a satyr-play.<sup>2</sup> Working on the generally accepted propositions, however, we arrive in any case at a dramatic situation closely parallel to that of the *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος* — Achilles, who himself corresponds now to Philoctetes, holding back the enterprise by sulking, and subjected to the wiles and taunts of Odysseus. Other means may have been called into service to bend his stubbornness, and, again like Philoctetes, in the end he may have begun to give way. It seems difficult to account for the appearance of Thetis, certified by fragment 562,<sup>3</sup> in any other way than as *dea ex machina*. She could hardly have spoken a formal Euripidean prologue, since she addresses Achilles. Like Heracles in the *Philoctetes*, she probably gave divine sanction to her son's already developing proclivity for conciliation. This marked moral analogy to the *dénouement* of the *Philoctetes*, which was brought out in 409 B.C., may be used to support the proposed late dating of the *Σύνδαιπνοι*.<sup>4</sup>

The *Aletes* provides another alluring field for speculation. The fragments give no real clue as to the subject, but Welcker<sup>5</sup> guesses at the story of *Ἀλήτης*, the son of Aegisthus, on the ground that the vicissitudes of no other mythological personage of this name contain suitable material for a tragedy. He is obliged to waive the fact that the only ancient who quotes the play, Stobaeus, always gives the title as *Ἀλείτης* (sinner); and the present writer is not certain that the tale of *Ἀλήτης* of Corinth, the descendant of Heracles, especially his

<sup>1</sup> For instance, the passages quoted by Pearson (II, p. 199) in regard to a work of Sophocles centering at Tenedos and to a banquet where Achilles was offended do not mention the *Σύνδαιπνοι* by name. If any one should venture to take up the issue again, he might argue that the identity of the two plays would explain the tardy arrival of Achilles in the *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος* by reference to the insult now connected with the *Σύνδαιπνοι*.

<sup>2</sup> Pearson (II, pp. 200–201) discards this suggestion too lightly.

<sup>3</sup> Not in Nauck.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Pearson, II, p. 202 (notes under fr. 562).

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 215.

struggle with Codrus of Athens, is not fraught with as great dramatic possibilities and does not jibe as well with the few lines that are preserved. Welcker's supposition, however, has been generally approved, and it must be acknowledged that the legend which Hyginus tells about the Mycenaean Aletes can be very neatly accommodated to the Sophoclean architecture. In violation of Sophocles' habit of naming the play after the protagonist, Electra would seem to have assumed the principal rôle, or at least she would have been a very important character and the recipient of the tests. The general course of development would be closely parallel to that of the extant *Electra*. Her will can be imagined to have been centered upon frustrating the usurpation of the throne by Aletes, as before by his father, and upon vengeance. The first test was another false report of Orestes' death, this time as an offering to Artemis in Tauris. In the account of Hyginus, the message is delivered at Mycenae, and Electra betakes herself to the Delphic oracle to seek the truth, or at least the details, of her brother's murder. If the false report was included in the action of the *Aletes*, the journey of Electra to Delphi (followed by Aletes) would seem to involve a change of scene; but the dramatic economy of Sophocles may have placed the action from the first at Delphi, whither she may have resorted for some such purpose as merely to get news of Orestes and where the tale of his death may have reached her and Aletes. In any case she was undaunted by the message; and very probably a second test consisted in the futile endeavor of Aletes to bend her to submission. Fragment 101<sup>1</sup> may very well be an assertion, on the part of Electra, of her consciousness of a just determination:

ψυχὴ γὰρ εὔνου καὶ φρονούσα τοῦνδικον  
κρείσσων σοφιστοῦ παντός ἐστιν εὐρεῖς.

The rest of the plot may have proceeded in the following manner. Iphigenia and Orestes arrive at Delphi on the same day, and the culminating test would be the confirmation of the death through the messenger's indication of Iphigenia as the priestess of the sacrifice. Even under this final blow Electra's will does not collapse. Instead of succumbing, she forces the recognition by a frenzied attack upon Iphigenia. Aletes is then slain by Orestes, and the most significant part of the *dénouement* is the marriage of Electra to Pylades.

<sup>1</sup> N. 97.

If the harshness of temperament that marks Electra in the play named after her is to be considered a tragic sin, the rough experiences of that play would not seem to have completely purged her, for in the *Aletes* she would still appear brutal enough to attempt the blinding of Iphigenia. She is not to be conceived as thoroughly cleansed and restored to harmony with the universal law of moderation (*σωφροσύνη*) until she has passed through all the additional trials of the *Aletes*; and her marriage with Pylades would be the final seal upon her reconciliation with the principles of right. The action of the *Aletes* would then constitute the same kind of sequel to the *Electra* as the *Oedipus Coloneus* to the *Oedipus King*, the marriage serving a purpose similar to that of the apotheosis of Oedipus; and, since the *Oedipus Coloneus* belongs to the end of Sophocles' career, another reason would be added to the arguments for the late dating of the lost tragedy.<sup>1</sup> If it was this myth that provided the plot, the fragments imply that the deuteragonist, Aletes, was delineated as an upstart and a rhetorical braggart.

Not much satisfaction can be derived from the scant information concerning the plays that Sophocles wrote on the myth of Alcmaeon and Eriphyle. The *Epigoni*, with which the tragedy quoted as the *Eriphyle* was possibly identical, evidently contained Alcmaeon's murder of his mother and his participation in the expedition of the Epigoni; and there has been a hot debate between scholars on the question whether Sophocles represented Alcmaeon as performing his father's bloody command before or after the expedition. One possible interpretation of the tragic sin may be urged in support of Pearson,<sup>2</sup> who takes up the cudgels for the latter alternative against the Germans. Pearson is troubled by the fact that Alcmaeon would thus unpardonably delay the execution of the paternal behest, and he eludes the difficulty by suggesting that Alcmaeon did not learn of the injunction until towards the end of the drama; but may not this very procrastination be the tragic sin? The play would have broken in two like the *Ajax*, if the first part had treated only the expedition and if the slaughter of Eriphyle was introduced as a new *motif* in the second half. The constant postponement of action by Alcmaeon would be needed to bind the sections together. The object of his will was

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Pearson, I, p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> I, pp. 130-131.

perhaps obedience to his father, and the tendency to delay may have been a kind of continuous test over which he was finally triumphant, together with other tests which may have been afforded by the second expedition against Thebes. Alcmaeon would thus have been delineated as the same kind of wavering, hesitating youth as the Orestes of the *Iphigenia in Tauris*, of the *Choephori* of Aeschylus, or even (though to a less extent) of Sophocles' own *Electra*. He too would deserve the catch-phrase that has been applied to Orestes — the "ancient Hamlet." Another analogy would be added to the obvious parallelisms between Alcmaeon and Orestes, such as the matricide and the subsequent Fury-driven madness.

To Aeschylus and to the modern reader Alcmaeon's great sin would be the killing of his mother, and there is reason to believe that Sophocles, in distinction from his attitude in the *Electra*, stressed the guilt to such a point that a second play was necessary to incorporate a ritualistic purification. This was the *Alcmaeon*, if, as has been generally held on very slight evidence, Sophocles here enshrined the same portion from the long myth as Euripides in the *Ἀλκμέων ὁ διὰ Ψωφίδος* and represented the hero as freed from the stain of crime by Phegeus, the king of Psophis in Arcadia. In any case, the matricide was not the "tragic sin" in the strict Aristotelian sense, i.e., the flaw in a great character. The vengeance wrought upon the sons of Phegeus for murdering Alcmaeon, no matter whether Alcmaeon's first wife, Alpheisiboea, or his second, Callirrhoe, was introduced as the instigator of this vengeance, indicates that he had attained to a degree of righteousness that made his assassination by the sons of Phegeus a serious offense. Perhaps he rid himself of the real tragic defect, whatever it was, and the *Alcmaeon* would bear the same relation to the *Epigoni* as the *Aletes* to the *Electra*. All this theorizing, however, rests only upon the most unsubstantial hypotheses, and possibly it was Eriphyle who acted the protagonist, at least of the *Epigoni* and of the *Eriphyle*, if the latter was a separate play and related that lady's treachery towards her husband, Amphiaraus. Certainly her misdeeds were of varied enough hues to have afforded a splendid choice to a dramatist.

Inasmuch as Thyestes is the only other person besides Oedipus whom Aristotle in the thirteenth chapter of the *Poetics* cites by name as a type of the lordly and not essentially vicious protagonist who is

plunged into ruin by some frailty, it would be particularly instructive if the plays by Sophocles on the tale of Atreus and his brother had survived, especially since it may be that in this case, as for the theme of Oedipus, Aristotle was referring to Sophocles. Not only the content of these plays, however, but even their number remains a mystery. That he wrote a tragedy to center in the anthropophagous banquet, seems fairly established; but there is no trustworthy evidence that permits a decision between the titles *Atreus* (of which an alternative name was the *Mycenaeen Women*) and the first *Thyestes* (Θυέστης α'). The two ancient passages which appear to bear upon the plot of this drama and which are quoted by Pearson<sup>1</sup> might as well allude to the substance of choral lyrics or to incidental references even in some other tragedies of Sophocles; or the more important passage, the scholium on line 812 of the *Orestes* of Euripides, may contemplate some one detail of the Sophoclean banquet-play, such as the drowning of Aerope, rather than the whole work. In any case the passages do not reveal any Sophoclean peculiarities in the treatment of the ordinary legend, except possibly Thyestes' submission of his claim upon the golden lamb to a legal court and the final murder of Thyestes by the vindictive Atreus.<sup>2</sup> It is easy to imagine either Atreus or Thyestes as protagonist, intent upon keeping the sovereignty for himself and balking at no obstacles. If it was this drama of which Aristotle was thinking, Thyestes would be the more natural choice, since it is he rather than his brother who is shattered by the catastrophe; and it must be remembered that Seneca used the title *Thyestes* for the same substance.

The one indubitable fact is that Sophocles wrote a drama called *Thyestes at Sicyon*. The prepositional phrase in the title plainly indicates that he here dramatized some aspect or aspects of the later unsavory history of that prince, which related his violation of his own daughter, Pelopia, his imprisonment by Atreus, his discovery of Aegisthus as the son of the incest, and the vengeance on his brother by the instrumentality of Aegisthus. It is tempting to follow

<sup>1</sup> I, p. 92.

<sup>2</sup> If Thyestes was murdered by Atreus in the banquet-play, this detail was at variance with Sophocles' treatment of the legend in the other play or plays on Thyestes, which represented him as still living.



Welcker's<sup>1</sup> conjectural reconstruction, which would make the tragedy strikingly analogous to the *Oedipus King*. The will of Thyestes would be directed towards escaping the oracle according to which he must cohabit with his daughter in order to beget an avenger. The incest would then be unconscious, either an effort on the part of Thyestes to avoid the sin that he fears by rushing into a similar but less heinous crime, or one of the sardonic interpositions of fate championed by Müller. Hyginus, who is the chief source for the story,<sup>2</sup> says that Thyestes asked the king of Sicyon to send him back to the family hearth in Lydia, and Welcker surmises that Sophocles conceived this detail as another effort of Thyestes to avert the prophecy. If, as is supposed, Hyginus derives his account from Sophocles, a tragic sin is suggested by the statement that Thyestes felt himself, even before the assault, as too far polluted to approach the shrine of Athena. Would this be the stain of his old adultery with Aerope and the theft of the lamb, or is it some other innate weakness? Or was lust his failing, the lust that in the first play betrayed him into adultery and in the second into seduction of a young maiden? In both instances, at least, the fault finally provoked a catastrophe. On the whole, such a drama as Welcker has ideated would have interested Aristotle more than the episodes connected with the gruesome feast.<sup>3</sup> The events surrounding the murder of Atreus are relegated by the German critic<sup>4</sup> (evidently following Brunck<sup>5</sup>) to a second play called *Thyestes*, implied by three ancient references.<sup>6</sup> In such a second play, the suicide of Pelopia, on learning that she has been unwittingly a victim of incest, would constitute a parallel to Jocasta's death. Pearson tends to believe in only one play dealing with the vicissitudes of Thyestes after the banquet. Dindorf holds that the second *Thyestes* was merely a reëdition of the first. The field is open to almost any hypothesis.<sup>7</sup> Possibly the aims of Thyestes in the Sicyon tragedy were

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 367-368.

<sup>2</sup> *Fab.* 88.

<sup>3</sup> Pearson (I, p. 93) takes the opposite view.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 369. Pearson (I, p. 187) apparently wrongly interprets Welcker to mean that the second *Thyestes* treated the theme of Plisthenes.

<sup>5</sup> R. F. P. Brunck, Ed. of seven plays with fragments, Strassburg, 1788, vol. III, p. 413.

<sup>6</sup> Pearson, I, p. 91.

<sup>7</sup> The discussion has shown that, instead of three tragedies, the *Atreus* (banquet-play), the first *Thyestes* (at Sicyon), and the second *Thyestes*, there may have been

still the recovery of the kingdom of Mycenae and revenge. Did he recognize his daughter and purposely violate her in order to attain the promise of the oracle, and was this one of the obstacles that he dared to overstep on his way to the throne? Then, fragment 247,<sup>1</sup> which asserts that the gods must be obeyed, no matter how shameful their commands, might be placed in the mouth of Thyestes himself as an apology for his outrage; fragments 256<sup>2</sup> and 258<sup>3</sup> likewise might allude to the advisability of bowing to necessity. In any case, Hyginus says that, when Thyestes was later captured by the Atridae at Delphi, he had gone there to consult the priestess upon the means of punishing his brother. If Hyginus reflects Sophocles in representing Thyestes as reinstated at Mycenae after Aegisthus has assassinated Atreus, it is natural to think of Thyestes as finally purified, although, as for Oedipus, the process has required two or even three tragedies.

The very title of the *Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις* proves that this play embodied the embassy of Menelaus and Odysseus to Troy, before the beleaguering of the city, in an attempt to obtain the surrender of Helen and thus prevent the war. The general tradition was that on this occasion the envoys were entertained by Antenor, the pacifist of the Trojan camp, and by Antenor's family. In view of the ordinary method of Sophocles, it is natural to think of Antenor as the protagonist, concentrating his will upon peace and upon hospitality towards the representatives of the Achaeans. Various details of the legend suggest the tests to which such a purpose might have been submitted. In the cause to which Antenor had consecrated himself, he carried his daring to such a degree that he allowed or prevailed upon his wife, Theano, to open the door of Athena's temple to Menelaus and Odysseus, and his sons to escort them. His unconcealed entertainment of them would have been another challenge hurled in the face of his compatriots. He would not have shrunk from the culminating test of rescuing them from murder at the hands of the Trojans.

Such an interpretation of the Sophoclean tragedy is strengthened

only two tragedies, the first *Thyestes* (identical with the *Atreus*) and the second *Thyestes*, containing all the later history of Thyestes.

<sup>1</sup> N. 226. The anthologist, Orion, in quoting this fragment (*Flor.*, 5, 10 in F. G. Schneidewin, *Coniectanea critica*, p. 47), definitely assigns it to the first *Thyestes*.

<sup>2</sup> N. 235.

<sup>3</sup> N. 237.

by the discovery of fragments of the dithyramb by Bacchylides which treats the same theme<sup>1</sup> and which includes those details of the story that tell of Theano's and the sons' participation. The dithyramb is likewise called 'Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις, but the significant point is that it has as an alternative and indeed first mentioned title, 'Ἀντηνορίδαι. The inevitable conclusion is that, at least in the version of Bacchylides, the sons of Antenor performed an important service, though the fragments do not include its description. Since Bacchylides introduced the envoys before the Trojan assembly, did this service consist in saving them from the wrath of those who had listened to the Achaean pleas? The action of the sons presupposes Antenor as an agent, and indeed the Greek patronymic is sometimes loosely used to include the father or even the whole family or clan<sup>2</sup> as well as the sons, so that even in the dithyramb Antenor himself may have been prominent. The whole question becomes more interesting in light of the fact that Sophocles wrote a play called the 'Ἀντηνορίδαι, upon the content of which there is no direct testimony. Until the publication of Bacchylides, it had generally been held that this play comprised the tale of the sparing of Antenor by the Achaeans at the sack of Troy and his subsequent peregrinations, and this theory still has its adherents; but Blass,<sup>3</sup> Wilamowitz,<sup>4</sup> and Smyth<sup>5</sup> regard the double title of the dithyramb as evidence that the 'Ἀντηνορίδαι of Sophocles was only another appellation for the 'Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις. Pearson is non-committal;<sup>6</sup> and Jebb<sup>7</sup> unnecessarily assumes that the identification implies a chorus of a portion of the numerous progeny usually accredited to

<sup>1</sup> R. C. Jebb, *Bacchylides, The Poems and Fragments*, Cambridge, 1905, no. xiv.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus in the Fifth Book seems to use the term *Pisistratidae* in the sense of the whole faction in favor of the tyranny. For a discussion of the practice of extending the patronymic to include father and sons, cf. R. Förster, *Philologische Parerga zum Laokoon, Verhandlungen der vierzigsten Versammlung deutscher Philologen in Görlitz*, 1889, pp. 435-436. Förster definitely adduces the case of the word 'Ἀντηνορίδαι as one of his instances, pointing particularly to an example in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.*, 1, 46).

<sup>3</sup> F. Blass, *Bacchylidis Carmina*, Leipzig, 1898, p. lviii.

<sup>4</sup> U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, review of Kenyon's publication of Bacchylides, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1898, p. 134.

<sup>5</sup> H. W. Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets*, London, 1900, p. 429.

<sup>6</sup> I, pp. 86-89.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 220, note 1.

Antenor, whereas the title does not really mean any more than that two or more of the sons acted leading rôles. An acceptance of the double Sophoclean title not only helps to illumine the shadowy and much disputed origins of Greek tragedy by providing a concrete historical instance of a dithyramb that may later have been developed into a tragedy, in case Bacchylides wrote his poem before Sophocles composed his play;<sup>1</sup> but it also virtually forces us to assign the chief part in the action to Antenor or his sons. If Antenor was subordinate, the sons, following the policy of their father, would have proved triumphant over the trials of their wills; and it is always possible that both Bacchylides and Sophocles merely represented parent and sons as working for the same end in conjunction.

The mode in which Sophocles treated the theft of the Palladium in the *Laconian Women* is too obscure to permit a decision as to whether in this play he went farther and utilized that version of the myth which considered Antenor actually guilty of treachery.

The outlines of the *Hermione* of Sophocles are definitely sketched for us by a scholium on the *Odyssey*, 4, 4, by the somewhat ampler statement of Eustathius,<sup>2</sup> and by a scholium on the *Orestes* of Euripides, 1655. Hermione, who had been married by Tyndareus to Orestes, was afterwards handed over by her father, Menelaus, to Neoptolemus. The latter betakes himself to Delphi to avenge himself on Apollo for his father's death, or (if the scholium on Euripides applies in this detail) to question the god about the childlessness of his wife. Involved in a quarrel with the priests of Phoebus, he is slain by one of them, Machaereus, and Hermione is restored to her cousin. If Sophocles observed his habit of naming a play after the protagonist, it is permissible to conjecture that the central *motif* was the constancy of Hermione to Orestes, tested by the various ordeals of her life with Neoptolemus. The same relation would thus have existed between the Hermione of Sophocles and the Hermione of Euripides' *Andro-*

<sup>1</sup> It is, of course, possible, as Blass suggests (*op. cit.*, p. lviii), that the double title was first applied to the work of Sophocles and then on this precedent used of the dithyramb; but the question of titles has no bearing upon the comparative chronology. In any case, the fact that the name 'Ἀντηνωρίδαι could be applied to the dithyramb is conclusive proof of the prominence of Antenor and his family in the version of Bacchylides.

<sup>2</sup> *Od.*, p. 1479.

*mache* as between the two Electras: as Euripides derogates from his Electra in order to rehabilitate Clytaemnestra, so his Hermione is a fiend compared to the character that may be attributed to the Sophoclean heroine.

On the other hand, a play with Neoptolemus as protagonist would perhaps have conformed better to the dramatic structure of Sophocles. There are many details in the legendary history of Neoptolemus that Sophocles might have taken as evidence of the frequent tragic sin of quickness to wrath — his slaughter of Priam, Polyxena, and (according to some authorities) of Astyanax, the violent seizure of Hermione that Ovid<sup>1</sup> ascribes to him, his eagerness to retaliate on Apollo for the death of Achilles, and his bloody dispute with the priests at Delphi, whatever may have been its cause. The impulsiveness of the youth in the *Philoctetes* would have degenerated into choler and even vindictiveness. His animosity against Apollo and Apollo's servants carried with it the other tragic sins of *ὑβρις* and sacrilege. Strabo<sup>2</sup> says that he actually attacked the temple. Euripides, in the *Andromache*,<sup>3</sup> speaks of an earlier journey to Delphi to overthrow the temple; but in accordance with the generally noble character that he lends to Neoptolemus in this play, he assigns as a reason for the second fatal journey the hero's desire to expiate his former impiety. A scholium on Pindar's Paean to the Delphians, published in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri,<sup>4</sup> suggests that in one version of the tale he tried to steal from the treasures of the temple in order to exact payment for the undoing of his father. The natural conclusion would be that Sophocles conceived his will as concentrated upon paternal vengeance and that the scholiast on the *Orestes* of Euripides (1655) is not referring to the Sophoclean play in the phrases in which he alleges that Neoptolemus went to Delphi to consult the oracle about Hermione's barrenness, although the desire for offspring may have been a subsidiary purpose or a cloak for his real purpose. One of the obstacles that he would have had to overcome would be the antagonism of Machaereus and the other priests. Even Müller's theory of the interference of fate may be dragged into service, for the visit to Delphi, instead of resulting as Neoptolemus had planned, proved to be the occasion of his death.

<sup>1</sup> *Her.*, 8, 10.

<sup>2</sup> 421.

<sup>3</sup> 50 ff., 1094, and 1095.

<sup>4</sup> V, p. 47.

The *Euryalus* belongs to the group of plays connected with the history of Odysseus, but no purificatory sequence can be discerned. The title of the first of the group, the 'Ὀδυσσεὺς μαινόμενος, reveals that the substance was the pretence of madness to evade military service. Perhaps the development was somewhat like that of the *Philoctetes*: Odysseus may have been intent on eluding participation in the Trojan expedition, though not for so noble a reason as Philoctetes, and may have yielded only at the end. The *Nausicaa* or Πλύντριαι was related to the group in much the same way as the *Andromeda* to the Perseus-sequence. May one hazard the guess that the drama was built up around the undaunted friendliness of the maiden, who meets the first test of the sight of the dishevelled stranger and does not flee, who continues graciously to perform the duties of hospitality, perhaps against the advice of her more prudish and timorous companions, and finally does not scruple to introduce him into her father's house? The subject of the *Phaeacians* is unknown. If it was really one of this cycle, the title may even have formed an additional alternative appellation for the *Nausicaa*. The plot of the *Euryalus*, we are told by Eustathius,<sup>1</sup> had to do with the tragic history of this son who was born to Odysseus, after the return from his wanderings, as a result of a *liaison* with the Thesprotian princess, Euipe, and who, according to Parthenius,<sup>2</sup> through the machinations of Penelope, was unwittingly slain by his father. Eustathius names Telemachus as the murderer of Euryalus, but there is no reason to think that this important variation is derived from the Sophoclean version. J. Vürtheim<sup>3</sup> seeks to establish a relationship between the *Euryalus* and the last play of the group, the 'Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ, by suggesting that the assassination of one son by Odysseus in the former piece justifies his own assassination by another son, Telegonus, in the latter; but even if true, such a conception has nothing to do with a purificatory sequence, especially in view of the fact that both homicides are committed under misapprehensions.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Od.*, p. 1796.

<sup>2</sup> *Amatoria Narrationes*, 3.

<sup>3</sup> *De Eugammonis Telegonia*, *Mnemosyne*, XXIX (1901), p. 57.

<sup>4</sup> We might find a purificatory sequence if we could follow J. N. Svoronos (*Ulysse chez les Arcadiens et la Télégonie d'Eugammon*, *Gazette Archéologique*, XIII, 1888, pp. 270 ff.) who believes that Sophocles represented Odysseus in the ἀκανθοπλήξ

The present investigation need not concern itself with the questions whether the Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ and the Νίπτρα were different names for the same drama, or how, if, as is likely, there was only one play, the subject of the recognition in a bath by the nurse Euryclea, implied in the second title, was yoked to the theme of Odysseus' death. It is the latter theme, embodied in the first title, that bears upon our purpose. The references to Dodona in the fragments indicate that Sophocles introduced the oracle prophesying that Odysseus should be slain by his own son, and it is natural to think that he likewise stressed the version of the myth which represented Odysseus avoiding and guarding himself against Telemachus as the son from whom danger was to be apprehended. The whole action would thus prove similar to that of the *Oedipus King*.<sup>1</sup> The will of Odysseus would be focused upon averting his presaged death. The general test to which he would have had to submit would be the necessity of cutting himself off from the companionship of his beloved son, Telemachus. If Ribbeck<sup>2</sup> rightly supposes that he returned from Dodona in disguise in order to be protected against every possibility of the fulfilment of the oracle,<sup>3</sup> and that the Νίπτρα section consisted in his recognition by Euryclea at this time and the imposition upon her of a command to secrecy, then the humiliation of the disguise would have constituted the first phase of the general test. The development may have represented other attempts to shun Telemachus. The Argument to the *Odyssey* published by Buttmann from a Palatine manuscript<sup>4</sup> contains a description of the death which may reflect the catastrophe of the Sophoclean tragedy and would then have included the culminating phase of the general test. Telegonus, the son by Circe, unexpectedly arrives at night to reveal himself to his father; Odysseus, fearing that it is an attack by Telemachus, conquers his paternal instinct so

as punished for his crimes in the *Philoctetes*! But this is wild conjecture and not the only piece of extravagance in Svoronos' article.

<sup>1</sup> Pearson himself (II, p. 109, n. 4) points out the parallelism between the shunning of Telemachus and Oedipus' flight from Corinth.

<sup>2</sup> Otto Ribbeck, *Die Römische Tragödie*, Leipzig, 1875, p. 273.

<sup>3</sup> Pearson (II, p. 109) observes, however, that such a procedure might prove "the most likely method of incurring the very danger which he was anxious to avoid."

<sup>4</sup> W. Dindorf, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*, Oxford, 1855, I, p. 6.

far as to arm himself and rush upon him, but in the confusion is not recognized and falls beneath his spear. Since the spear was fitted with a point made from the *ἄκανθα* (spike or prickly) of the fish called the roach, Odysseus thus realized the title of the play, *ἄκανθοπλήξ*; and for this reason, as well as because Telegonus had sailed to Ithaca, he fulfilled the other, earlier prophecy that the source of his death should come from the sea.<sup>1</sup> As the determination of Oedipus finally results in the discovery of himself as the culprit, so the persistence of Odysseus in forestalling any patricidal attempt on the part of the son whom he suspects becomes, through the operation of fate, the cause of his dissolution.

From the papyrus fragments that have restored to us scenes from a Sophoclean play treating the death of Eurypylos at the hands of Neoptolemus (whether or not it went by the title of *Eurypylos*), the only fact that emerges apposite to our present purpose is a possible tragic sin of the mother of the Trojan champion, Astyoche. In lines 40 ff. of the fragment that Pearson numbers 210, she clearly reiterates that her son's death came to her as a punishment, and in line 41 the chorus agree with her.<sup>2</sup> Sophocles probably had in mind the tradition that, like a less heinous Eriphyle, she had been bribed to allow Eurypylos to go to the war by Priam's gift of his ancestral possession, the golden vine.

<sup>1</sup> If we accept the more usual interpretation of the *ἐξ ἄλως* of *Od.* 11, 134, instead of "remote from the sea."

<sup>2</sup> The reading and interpretation of line 46 are too uncertain to have any bearing upon the question of the attitude of the chorus on this point. Pearson's reading can mean only: "Fortune hath unjustly (*οὐ δίκῃ*) shorn thee." He elucidates the earlier application of the word *δίκῃ* to Astyoche by the chorus as signifying that punishment (not justice) will be visited upon her, so that I suppose that he would construe the sense of the chorus in line 46 to be that Astyoche is unjustly punished. In any case, punishment implies a sin (unless its meaning be weakened to mere maltreatment), and it is hard to see in what way "unjustly" could have been applied to the fate of Astyoche. Hunt (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. IX, p. 120) and Wilamowitz read and explain line 46 to mean: "Fortune has shorn thee but judges thee not." I have difficulty in understanding just what such a statement on the part of the chorus would imply; but since Hunt resorts to this reading in order to avoid the contradiction involved in Pearson's text, he evidently believes that in line 41 the chorus intend to say that Astyoche is chastised by Justice. Line 45 proves that Astyoche, at least, was conscious of retribution.



Although the fragments of the *Thamyras* shed no light upon the questions that we are now examining, the title itself is illuminating. It was the universal tradition that the bard had incurred the envy of heaven by daring to measure himself with the Muses. In line 917 of the *Rhesus* the word ὕβρις is actually used of his sin. Sophocles may very well have represented Thamyras throughout the play as intent upon proving his musical and poetic skill. The proposition of a contest with the Muses would have been the supreme trial of this purpose; and the result, once more, by the interference of fate, is a catastrophe rather than a victory. The final scene, especially, which depicted the protagonist stricken with blindness and sorrow, must have been closely parallel to that of the *Oedipus King*.

The Καμικοί contained the story of Minos' discovery of Daedalus at Camicus by the trick of the threaded shell and of Daedalus' escape by provoking the murder of Minos in a bath of boiling water or pitch. If Daedalus was the protagonist, we have the authority of Photius<sup>1</sup> for the fact that Sophocles ascribed to him a crime that may have been a concrete illustration of a tragic defect of character. The crime was the one of which the general mythological tradition accused Daedalus, the murder of his nephew Perdix,<sup>2</sup> and the defect of character would have been jealousy, in this instance of the younger man's skill. It is not possible, however, to discover whether Sophocles represented Daedalus as in any way purified or punished.

The *Colchian Women*, the *Root-gatherers*, and the *Scythians* treated the story of Jason and Medea, but the evidence is not sufficient to indicate a purificatory sequence. The first play represented the vicissitudes of Jason in Colchis. It may be surmised that his will was centered upon obtaining the Golden Fleece and that the tests consisted of the trials which Aeetes forced him to undergo. As a culminating test, he would have carried his determination so far as to plot the murder of Medea's brother, Apsyrtus, or at least to consent to the crime. The subject of the *Root-gatherers* seems to have been the destruction of Pelias by his daughters through the attempted rejuvenation at the instigation of Medea. The title shows that the chorus

<sup>1</sup> *Lex.*, p. 413, 11.

<sup>2</sup> Another mythological tradition calls him Talos or Calos, and bestows the name of Perdix upon his mother.

comprised those who assisted Medea or the Peliades in the plucking of magical herbs. It is natural to think of Pelias as the protagonist, stained as he was with a sin of omission or sacrilege against Hera and characterized, according to the general tradition, by the defect of cruelty, which had manifested itself recently in the extermination of Jason's whole family. He would have been bent upon outwitting the repatriated Jason. He may have considered the recovery of his youthful vigor a means to this end, and so, as a final test, he would have submitted to the ordeal of the cauldron. Sophocles may have followed the version of the myth that conceived the outraged Hera to have been the original promoter of the voyage to Colchis in order to bring back Medea as the instrument of vengeance upon Pelias. If so, the idea of retribution for a tragic sin would here be very striking. Pelias was intent upon the rejuvenation, but once again fate interfered to change the result of his perilous experiment into disaster. There is not enough agreement among scholars in regard to the substance of the third play, the *Scythians*, to afford a basis even for hypothesis.

The general voice of mythical tradition ascribed to Laocoon, the protagonist of Sophocles' tragedy of the same name, the tragic sin of sacrilege or of ἔβρις against heaven and so justified his horrible fate; but accounts varied as to the exact nature of the misdeed. Some said that he had aroused the despoise of Apollo, either through disobedience or through profanation of a temple. According to others, Athena was his enemy. Virgil<sup>1</sup> says that he had incurred her ire by piercing with a spear the wooden horse that she intended to be the means of bestowing the victory upon her beloved Greeks. It is doubtful, however, whether a dramatist would have considered Laocoon's patriotic distrust of the wooden horse as criminal. Perhaps the casting of the spear was looked upon as an unnecessarily violent demonstration of this distrust and as a final manifestation of an old and deep-seated velleity to fierce passion and ἔβρις. It is even possible that Sophocles did not, from any standpoint, judge the performance to deserve punishment but simply utilized it as the direct occasion of Athena's immediate wrath and of the consequent visitation of the serpents, and that he sought the real reason for the catastrophe in past transgressions. With so many choices the exact crime is difficult to select. Karl

<sup>1</sup> *Aen.* 2, 229-231.

Robert,<sup>1</sup> who guesses that the scene of the punishment was the temple of Apollo Thymbraeus, decides on the crime of profanation, on the ground that the dramatists liked to depict the guilty as paying the penalty in the same spot in which they had erred. Pearson<sup>2</sup> finds the early offenses of Laocoon "too remote" to have served as a proper reason for chastisement and ascribes to the protagonist a general arrogance of temperament, of which he, too, believes that the hurling of the spear may have been an expression.

The will of Laocoon may very well have been directed towards saving his compatriots from the menace of the wooden horse. If the *Bibliotheca* that goes under the name of Apollodorus reflects Sophocles, the fact that the two extant epitomes of the last books of that work<sup>3</sup> mention a speech of Laocoon against the reception of the horse would indicate that one of the tests was such a rhetorical debate with his opponents as is embodied in the dispute between the heroine and Clytaemnestra in the *Electra*.<sup>4</sup> Finally, to demonstrate his countrymen's infatuation, he dared even the apparent sacrilege of casting a spear at the equestrian image which purported to be hallowed to Athena. But fate again takes up the skeins, and makes this act, not the method of Troy's deliverance, but the immediate cause of his own ruin.

Sophocles must have taken a peculiar delight in dramatizing the tale of Polyidus in the play of that name, which had as an alternative title, *Mávreis*, for it adapted itself very prettily to his system of construction on a framework of tests. The first test over which Polyidus was victorious in proving his gift of divination was probably the obligation of solving the riddle about the cow of Minos which had the chameleon-like trick of changing color three times a day. The second was the necessity of discovering the lost corpse of the son of Minos, Glaucus. The third and severest ordeal was the restoration of the body to life. Perhaps fragment 397,<sup>5</sup> which refers to achievement only by hard effort, was applied to the triumphal vindication of

<sup>1</sup> *Bild und Lied*, Berlin, 1881, p. 200.

<sup>2</sup> II, p. 41. The offenses of Laocoon are no more "remote" than those of Ajax against the gods in the extant tragedy.

<sup>3</sup> 5, 17 (*Mythographi Graeci*, I).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. my article, p. 82.

<sup>5</sup> N. 365. Such must be the meaning of the line, whatever the correct reading.

Polyidus' supernatural powers by the ordeals through which he had to pass.

There is little room for doubt that Sophocles in his *Meleager*<sup>1</sup> followed closely the Homeric version.<sup>2</sup> This material must have appealed to him strongly, not only because, like that of the *Polyidus*, it presented a series of tests, ready-made, but also because it concerned itself with one of those sulking heroes, such as Philoctetes and Achilles, whom he enjoyed bringing into the theatre. The section of the story chosen for representation must have been that in which the protagonist, in high disdain at his mother, had withdrawn from the leadership in the war against the Curetes, for a scholium on the line of the *Iliad*<sup>3</sup> that speaks of an embassy of priests beseeching him to return to the front definitely states that Sophocles formed his chorus of this delegation. He excluded from the action itself the whole episode of the boar and Meleager's slaughter of his uncle or uncles; and he followed the usual Greek tragic practice of representing only the events immediately connected with the catastrophe.<sup>4</sup> The tests of Meleager's determination to remain inactive were probably constituted of all or some of the six separate attempts to recall him to his duty enumerated in Homer's account: he is there subjected to the entreaties of the elders, the priests,<sup>5</sup> Oeneus,<sup>6</sup> his sisters,<sup>7</sup> his mother,<sup>8</sup> and his comrades.<sup>9</sup> As Philoctetes begins to weaken before the ingenuous nobility of Neoptolemus, so Meleager, after the fashion intimated in the *Iliad*,<sup>10</sup> may have been shaken by the simple and loving solicitude of his wife;<sup>11</sup> as Heracles completes the transformation inaugurated by Neoptolemus, so the advance of the enemy to the very door of Meleager may have lent convincing force to his wife's words.

But he saves Calydon from the Curetes, only himself immediately or eventually to perish. What was the tragic sin to justify this doom?

<sup>1</sup> For the evidence, see Pearson, II, pp. 64-66.

<sup>2</sup> *Il.*, 9, 529-599. <sup>3</sup> 575.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. my article on the *Dramatic Art of Aeschylus*, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XVI (1905), pp. 22-24.

<sup>5</sup> 574-575.

<sup>7</sup> 584.

<sup>9</sup> 585.

<sup>6</sup> 581.

<sup>8</sup> 584.

<sup>10</sup> 590 ff.

<sup>11</sup> The strength of Meleager's will is perhaps to be inferred from the fact that the second account in Apollodorus, which probably reflects Sophocles (cf. below), states that he was persuaded with difficulty (*μόλυσ*).

Surely that testiness which Homer mentions thrice<sup>1</sup> as occasioning his retirement from the battle and which was usually considered to have spurred him on to slay his mother's brother or brothers.<sup>2</sup> The second version of the myth given in the *Bibliotheca* attributed to Apollodorus<sup>3</sup> uses the participle ὀργιζόμενον in explanation of Meleager's retirement. This allusion to Meleager's wrath is peculiarly apposite, since the presence of a few modifications of the Homeric account may indicate that the author of the *Bibliotheca* was here following a dramatic adaptation of the passage in the *Iliad*, and since a process of exclusion almost narrows us down to the belief that this adaptation was the work of Sophocles. Another epic tradition<sup>4</sup> declared that Meleager was killed by Apollo. If Sophocles accepted this, he may have conceived of the vengeance of Apollo as prompted also by some sacrilege; or the god may have been merely the instrument of his sister Artemis, who visits the sin of the father, Oeneus, upon the son. In the latter instance, as in the *Laocoön*, it would be only the constitutional defect of anger that really deserved punishment, and the operation of Apollo and Artemis would be nothing more than the fortuitous occasion of the disaster.

The mere mention of the title *Niobe* at once implies as a basis for Sophocles' tragedy one of the most celebrated instances of ὕβρις included in Greek mythology. The only point that needs comment is that, in a fragment of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri<sup>5</sup> which has been generally assigned to this play, the speaker, who is probably Niobe's father, Tantalus, definitely states the tragic sin, if we accept Pearson's restoration, in connection with a description of the resulting catastrophe:

ἡ θεοῖσιν ἔμολεν εἰς ἐκουσίους μάχας.

<sup>1</sup> 553, 565, and 566. The tale of Meleager is introduced into the *Iliad* as an example of sulkiness keeping a warrior from the fight, and he is compared to Achilles.

<sup>2</sup> Ovid, in describing this episode (*Metam.*, 8, 437), applies to Meleager the phrase *tumida frendens ira*. Although Sophocles excluded the murder of the uncle or uncles from the action itself, it may very well have been mentioned in the play and ascribed to Meleager's hot temper. The murder is referred to in the second account of Apollodorus, which is supposed to be derived from Sophocles.

<sup>3</sup> I, 72-73.

<sup>4</sup> Pearson, II, p. 65.

<sup>5</sup> Pearson, fr. 574.

On grounds that do not seem to me at all conclusive, Pearson<sup>1</sup> takes the fragment, which narrates the stony fate of Niobe, out of its natural connection and accredits it to the *Tantalus*; but even if it belonged to the *Tantalus*, it would have significance as embodying, at least in another play, Sophocles' explicit realization of the tragic sin in the protagonist of the *Niobe*. To Tantalus himself various manifestations of arrogance against heaven were attributed. The appearance of the name of Hermes in fragment 573<sup>2</sup> of the *Tantalus* of Sophocles suggests that one of the transgressions adduced by our dramatist was his perjured denial to that god of complicity in the theft of the Cretan dog of Zeus. To the modern reader this seems a comparatively light offense; and Sophocles himself may very well have included such other iniquities as the repast on his son, Pelops, or the stealing of the nectar and ambrosia.

Aristotle's allusion to the *Peleus*<sup>3</sup> as one of the two typical examples of a tragedy of character makes it particularly regrettable that so little is known of the play. The mention of the protagonist as an old man in fragment 487<sup>4</sup> shows that the action dealt with the miseries resulting from his dethronement and expulsion from Phthia by Acastus. Was it his old sin of collusion in the murder of his brother Phocus for which he was paying the price? Was his earlier purification

<sup>1</sup> II, p. 97. He believes that the speech of Tantalus at the end of the *Niobe* would imply the anomaly of a kind of epilogue, in which the scene was changed from Thebes, the seat of the tragedy, to Lydia, the home of Tantalus, and that even the chorus would have thus to be conceived as transported across the sea. But he himself acknowledges that a theophany may be postulated in order to relate to the audience that final removal of Niobe to Lydia which is stated to have been a part of the Sophoclean play both in a scholium on the *Iliad*, 24, 602, and in Eustathius (*Il.*, p. 1367, 22). May not Tantalus have been the personage who appeared at Thebes in the conclusion through supernatural agency, and performed the office of a kind of *deus ex machina*, describing particularly the ultimate fate of his daughter? Tantalus was certainly a character in the *Niobe* of Aeschylus (cf. Nauck, frs. 158 and 159), there bemoaning his own lot as in the Sophoclean papyrus fragment; and there is no reason that he should not have indulged in self-commiseration, as a secondary issue, also in the Sophoclean tragedy of the same name.

<sup>2</sup> Not in Nauck.

<sup>3</sup> *Poetics*, 18, 1456 a1. By general consent, the reference is to the Sophoclean *Peleus* rather than the Euripidean.

<sup>4</sup> N. 447.

from this crime at the hands of Eurytion only partial, and like another Oedipus at Colonus, was he now working out his final salvation? Such a reconstruction of the moral development of the *Peleus* would receive some confirmation, if we accept the theory of Ahrens<sup>1</sup> in regard to the substance of the *Phthiotides*, and consider it to have been the first member of a purificatory sequence of which the *Peleus* was the second. No material exists even to suggest the contents of the *Phthiotides*, except that the title and the coupling of this tragedy and the *Peleus* by Aristotle as instances of dramas based upon character indicate that it had something to do with the Aeacidæ of Phthia. Ahrens has as much right as any one else to a guess; he surmises that the play treated the arrival of Peleus at Phthia for purification from the assassination of his brother, his marriage to the princess of Phthia, Antigone, his unintentional murder of his father-in-law, Eurytion, his resort to the court of Acastus at Iolcos, his rejection of the improper proposals of the wife of Acastus, Astydamia, and the malicious message of Astydamia to Antigone, stating that Peleus was to marry the daughter of Acastus, Sterope, and thus causing Antigone to hang herself in despair. This conjecture as to the theme of the *Phthiotides* and my own theory as to the moral interpretation of the *Peleus* are mutually corroborative. If the *Phthiotides* thus concerned itself with Peleus' strength of will and purification, it would certainly conform to Aristotle's classification among the tragedies of character. Ahrens believes that directions for purification are embodied in fragment 694 of the *Phthiotides*:<sup>2</sup>

νέος πέφυκας· πολλὰ καὶ μαθεῖν σε δεῖ,  
καὶ πόλλ' ἀκούσαι καὶ διδάσκεισθαι μακρά.<sup>3</sup>

He himself points out the analogy of the divine injunctions to Oedipus at Colonus; but if there was a purificatory sequence, it would be more exact to compare the *Peleus* to the *Oedipus Coloneus*. The return of Neoptolemus and his restoration of his grandfather to honor would

<sup>1</sup> Didot publication of *Sophoclis Tragoediae et Perditarum Fragmenta*, 2d ed., Paris, 1864, p. 287.

<sup>2</sup> N. 632.

<sup>3</sup> Ahrens seems to refer this fragment to the purification of Peleus from the involuntary assassination of Eurytion; but Sophocles' words might as well apply to purification from the voluntary assassination of Phocus.

take the place of the apotheosis of Oedipus. The marriage to Thetis in the interval between the periods of time covered by the *Phthiotides* and the *Peleus* may have been viewed by Sophocles, according to the general mythological tradition, as a heavenly reward for the hero's chastity, and it thus might have signified for the dramatist one of the earlier steps in the purification.

The story of Cycnus, the son of Poseidon, which occupied at least one section of the *Ποιμένες*, afforded Sophocles another example of a military hero punished for arrogance. Pearson<sup>1</sup> himself points out that fragment 501<sup>2</sup> clearly indicates his boastful nature and that fragment 507<sup>3</sup> may possibly be interpreted in the same way. His doom was death at the hands of Achilles.

If one reads the account of Sinon's ruse in Quintus Smyrnaeus,<sup>4</sup> keeping in mind the Sophoclean method of obtaining unity by representing the will of the protagonist as constantly centered upon one purpose, he can scarcely resist the conclusion that the epic poet based his narrative largely upon the tragic writer's lost play named after the wily Greek. Quintus almost overdoes the emphasis upon Sinon's undaunted determination to trick the enemy. The Greek stands "steadfast as a rock" with "unyielding limbs"<sup>5</sup> against the torture that would test his truthfulness. He has mustered in his heart<sup>6</sup> the great endurance (*κάπρος*) that Hera has breathed into it.<sup>7</sup> His spirit is firm,<sup>8</sup> unbroken by the suffering,<sup>9</sup> since it is the part of a strong man to sustain evil necessity.<sup>10</sup> The account of Quintus seems even to suggest the succession of the Sophoclean episodes, each one embodying a new test of the protagonist's determination. First, Sinon has to maintain his plan of deceit against the friendly questions of the Trojans.<sup>11</sup> Next, it is to their threats that he has to submit,<sup>12</sup> and finally to torture by actual mutilation.<sup>13</sup> Since no very definite reconstruction of the *Sinon* has hitherto been attempted, this tragedy provides a

<sup>1</sup> II, p. 149.

<sup>2</sup> N. 460.

<sup>3</sup> N. 466.

<sup>4</sup> I 2, 360 ff.

<sup>5</sup> 365-366.

<sup>6</sup> 370.

<sup>7</sup> 373.

<sup>8</sup> 371-372.

<sup>9</sup> 387.

<sup>10</sup> 388.

<sup>11</sup> 362-363.

<sup>12</sup> 363-364. Virgil (*Aen.* 2, 64) applies the verb *includere* to the Trojan treatment of Sinon, and he calls him *fidens animi* and ready to meet even death in his undertaking (61-62).

<sup>13</sup> 364 ff.



striking exemplification of the way in which a consideration of the principles of Sophocles' dramatic art may determine, when other evidence fails, the substance of the plot of a lost play and the course of the development. The *Sinon* that Aristotle himself, or some later interpolator<sup>1</sup> in the text of the *Poetics*, adduces as one of the dramas drawn from the *Little Iliad* is generally held to be the work of Sophocles. It is always possible that Quintus depended upon the *Little Iliad* rather than upon the play, but in that case the passage in the cyclic epic must already have been so Sophoclean in its structure that there would have been little for the tragic poet to change.

The ordinary custom of Sophocles in titles would suggest that Tereus was the protagonist in the play named after him. His tragic sin would have consisted of his definite crime of adultery. But Procne had certainly exhibited savagery in her retaliation. Fragment 589<sup>2</sup> plainly states that the remedy of the sisters was worse than the ill that they sought to cure; and fragment 590,<sup>3</sup> containing what are probably the concluding anapaests and ultimate moral of the drama, applies rather to the wife than to the husband in its solemn declaration that vengeance belongs to Zeus.

The first *Tyro* of Sophocles seems to have been similar in subject and treatment to the extant *Electra*. The theme of the second *Tyro* is not known; it may have been merely a revision of the first. Since a line of the second *Tyro* is quoted in the *Birds*, it probably should be assigned to the years immediately before the date of the comedy, 414 B.C. The likelihood would be that the first *Tyro* was not brought out much earlier, and it therefore may be placed in the period from 420 to 415 B.C. The interesting fact is that the analogous *Electra* is usually ascribed roughly to the decade 420-410 B.C., even if it be conceived as subsequent to the Euripidean play of the same name. The hypothetical dating of either tragedy of Sophocles would thus corroborate that of the other.

Like *Electra*, *Tyro* is a derelict in the house of cruel relatives who maltreat her. The place of the stepfather Aegisthus as the chief tormentor is taken by the stepmother Sidero. Pollux<sup>4</sup> definitely states that the *Tyro* of Sophocles was buffeted black and blue by her step-

<sup>1</sup> 23, 1459b7.

<sup>2</sup> N. 530.

<sup>3</sup> N. 531.

<sup>4</sup> *Onomasticon*, 4, 141.

mother, so that the protagonist had to use a special mask to make visible to the audience the results of the blows. The beauty of Electra is also marred and even calls forth an exclamation of angry remonstrance from her brother.<sup>1</sup> The actual fragments of the *Tyro* contain several references to the indignities to which the protagonist has been subjected. She has been sheared of that luxuriance of hair which was renowned in ancient tradition.<sup>2</sup> Fragments 661<sup>3</sup> and 663<sup>4</sup> seem to belong to her self-commiseration; even the language of the latter,

τίκτουσι γάρ τοι καὶ νόσους δυσθυμίας,

is surprisingly parallel to that with which the chorus describes Electra,

σῆ δυσθύμῳ τίκτουσ' αἰὲ  
ψυχῇ πολέμους.<sup>5</sup>

If the bits of papyrus included under fragment 649 in Pearson really belong to the *Tyro*, perhaps he is right in discerning in lines 42 ff. a further lament of the heroine for her ill-usage. We may imagine the will of Tyro as centered, like that of Electra, upon vengeance and upon obduracy under her persecution. The *dénouement* was achieved in very much the same way as in the *Electra*: her children, who had been exposed, return, are recognized by their mother, and avenge her by slaying Sidero. The scholium on the *Orestes* of Euripides, 1691, which states that the *ἀναγνωρισμός* took place at the conclusion of the play, is very significant, for it proves that, as in the *Electra*,<sup>6</sup> the solace of the protagonist was postponed until the end in order that her will might be tested to the uttermost.

One is left to conjecture whether Sophocles found a tragic sin in Tyro's *liaison* with Poseidon, from which her children were born. Are we to discern an apology for her in fragment 665,<sup>7</sup> which voices the sentiment that involuntary sin is not culpable? Welcker<sup>8</sup> places it in the mouth of Tyro but considers it an excuse for the exposition of the infants under the command of Poseidon. On the basis of Pearson's theory that Sophocles conceived her marriage with her uncle

<sup>1</sup> *El.*, 1181.

<sup>2</sup> Fr. 659; N. 598.

<sup>3</sup> N. 600.

<sup>4</sup> N. 602.

<sup>5</sup> *El.*, 218-219.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. my article on Sophocles, p. 73.

<sup>7</sup> N. 604.

<sup>8</sup> See p. 315.

Cretheus as subsequent to her vindication at the end of the play,<sup>1</sup> the nuptials may have constituted a concrete symbol of her purification, if the dramatist represented her as guilty.

The *Phaedra* of Sophocles is unfortunately little more than a name to us. The rather copious fragments throw no light upon the subject of the present investigation, except that number 680,<sup>2</sup> if assigned to the protagonist,<sup>3</sup> would embody an appeal for condonement on the ground that the love for Hippolytus was the visitation of some god. Was *Phaedra* conceived as an essentially noble personage ruined by the defect of a fortuitous passion that was not characteristic of her fundamental nature? Or was she essentially base, and did the play therefore represent merely the richly deserved punishment of a criminal?

Both of the tragedies to which the title of *Phineus* was given provide an instance of a protagonist suffering for his guilt. A scholium on Apollonius Rhodius, 2, 178, plainly declares that Phineus was himself deprived of sight because he had blinded his sons. The strife within the family was the theme of the first *Phineus*.<sup>4</sup> The fact of the tragic sin is apparent, whether the statement is understood in the literal sense of the father's own execution of the bloody task, or whether, according to the version that Sophocles himself adopts in the fourth stasimon of the *Antigone*,<sup>5</sup> he merely shared in the crime by allowing his second wife, *Idaea*, to perpetrate the mutilation of her stepsons. The assault upon the sons may have carried with it the maltreatment of their mother, his first wife, *Cleopatra*, if Sophocles represented her as surviving but divorced and imprisoned by her husband in order to facilitate his second marriage. *Phineus* may have been treated also as a victim of some of the other shortcomings that ancient tradition ascribed to him, such as his insult to *Apollo* by preferring the loss of light to death and his impiety in abusing his gift of divination. If the wrath of *Apollo* was a *motif*, it would have appeared in the second play, which depicted the Argonauts' rescue of *Phineus* from the persecution of the *Harpies*, for the version that alludes to *Apollo* makes him the sender of the unclean birds. The old sufferer

<sup>1</sup> II, p. 273.

<sup>2</sup> N. 619.

<sup>3</sup> Welcker, p. 398.

<sup>4</sup> For the evidence, see Pearson, II, p. 313.

<sup>5</sup> 973 ff.

was probably shown as purified by affliction. One critic, G. Wolff,<sup>1</sup> actually adduces that very parallel of the *Oedipus Coloneus* which has been so often employed in the present article for the study of lost tragedies. May we suppose that in the second *Phineus*, as in the *Oedipus Coloneus*, the will of the protagonist was centered upon reconciliation with heaven? In any case, the first and second *Phineus* seem to have formed a purificatory sequence.

This review of the non-extant plays apposite to our investigation can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as corroboratory of the structural methods exhibited by Sophocles in the seven tragedies that we possess. The scantiness of the material permits categorical assertions in regard to only a few of the lost dramas; but in many other cases there is a high degree of probability that the same structural principles were utilized, and in a large number of instances there exists at least a possibility. One example of probability or possibility would not have much force, but the multiplication of such examples constitutes cumulative evidence almost, if not quite, as cogent as absolute fact. Every instance of probability or possibility approaches the nearer to certainty by each addition of a similar case. The concentration and testing of the will are more difficult to demonstrate than other phases of Sophoclean art, because they would be revealed only by a detailed knowledge of the plot or by the possession of a considerable portion of the text. In plays, however, like the *Teucer*, the *Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ*, the *Polyidus*, the *Meleager*, the *Sinon*, and the first *Tyro*, the system of concentration and tests irresistibly suggests itself as a dramatic framework; and the plots of many other tragedies by Sophocles, as far as we know them, are of such a nature as to adapt themselves easily to the arrangement. The tragic sin emerges more clearly. In the first *Athamas*, the *Thamyras*, *Laocoon*, *Niobe*, *Tantalus*, *Ποιμένες*, *Tereus*, and the two *Phineus* plays, it is certain. In the *Locrian Ajax*, the high degree of probability amounts to virtual certainty, and the rest of the catalogue of Sophocles' work comprises other examples in which the presence of a tragic sin may be postulated with more or less confidence. The poet seems to have made purificatory sequences in writing the plays on Philoctetes and Phineus, and may very well have created such sequences also out of the plays on

<sup>1</sup> *Philologus*, XXVIII, p. 344.

Athamas, on Electra and Aletes, on Telephus, on Thyestes, and on Peleus.

One other interesting fact must have impressed the reader: Sophocles sometimes used very similar plots, or at least adapted the mythical deposit to a norm that he had employed before. The plot of the *Oedipus King*, for instance, was probably paralleled in the *Larissaei*, the *Thyestes at Sicyon*, and the *Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ*. The character of Telephus in the *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος* and the treatment of the situation seem to have been duplicated in the extant *Philoctetes*; and there is likelihood that the *Aletes* and the first *Tyro* were analogous to the *Electra*. The action of the *Σύνδειπνοι* was almost identical with that of the *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος*. Originality, or let us say rather, novelty, of theme, whether in literature or art, has not been so highly valued in past epochs as in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; and our predecessors of antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance preferred to seek perfection in the manner in which they presented their material.

I have suggested in another place<sup>1</sup> that Sophocles abandoned Aeschylus' habit of calling plays after the choruses and used the name of the protagonist as a title because his dramas depicted the triumph of the protagonist's will. This statement was based upon the extant tragedies; but in the non-extant works also a marked preponderance of titles derived from the protagonists may be observed. A certain number of the lost plays, however, may have been named after a less prominent character. Examples of such possible exceptions are the *Atreus*, the *Andromeda*, the *Aletes*, the *Aleadae*, the *Hermione*, and the *Tereus*. The *Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις* and the *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος* took their titles from the chief event embodied in each drama. The *Ἀντηγόριδαι* may have been an alternative appellation for the former, perhaps the one originally applied by Sophocles, and the sons of Antenor, either with or without their father,<sup>2</sup> were probably the protagonists. Since Telephus seems to have been the leading figure in the first part of the *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος* and Achilles in the second part, it was manifestly impossible to name the drama after a single character; and possibly for this reason Sophocles resorted to a nomenclature based upon an event. The name of the *Trachiniae* is perhaps to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my article on Sophocles, p. 86.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. above, p. 27.

be explained on this principle, for Heracles in the latter half assumes the prominence that Deianira had enjoyed in the earlier scenes. The same principle of nomenclature may even have operated in certain of the lost dramas that Sophocles named after choruses in the archaic fashion. The importance of both Atreus and Thyestes in the play upon the hideous banquet, for instance, perhaps left Sophocles in a quandary as to which of the two should receive the honor of being the sponsor of the work, and he may have fallen back upon the compromise of the *Mycenaeen Women*, which the old grammarians knew as an alternative for the *Atreus*. The hypothetical alternative title, *Minos*, for the *Καμικοί* suggests that Minos was as conspicuous in the action as Daedalus, and so once more Sophocles may have had to call the chorus into service for his name. Perhaps also in the *Laconian Women*, no one character stood forth so preëminently as to deserve the distinction of providing the title. The *Epigoni* is virtually the name of an event, and here again the title used by Sophocles himself may have been the alternative, *Eriphyle*,<sup>1</sup> who was possibly the protagonist.

In several other instances, besides those already mentioned, of tragedies called after choruses, the reason is not apparent. Examples are the *Larissaei*, the *Ποιμένες*, the *Scyrians*, the *Σύνδεσπνοι*, and the *Phthiotides*. As far as our evidence goes, they should have conformed to the practice of a nomenclature derived from the protagonist. In some cases, the retention of the chorus-name may be due to an early date. If the *Mysians* preceded the *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος* chronologically as well as logically, it belonged to the beginning of Sophocles' career.<sup>2</sup> The Aeschylean language of fragments 34 and 35<sup>3</sup> of the *Captive Maidens* implies an early date; and the striking fact that all three plays upon the tale of Jason and Medea, the *Colchian Women*, the *Root-gatherers*, and the *Scythians*, receive their names from the choruses has more force in proving that he composed them when he was still under the influence of his great predecessor, than if only one of the series were so entitled. The *Root-gatherers*, however, possibly had as an alternative title the name of Pelias,<sup>4</sup> who seems to have been the

<sup>1</sup> If the *Eriphyle* was not a separate play.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. above, p. 18.

<sup>3</sup> N. 31 and 32.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Pearson, II, p. 274, under fragment 648.

protagonist. The appellation, the *Lemnian Women*, may be occasioned by the fact that the companions of Hypsipyle played rôles almost as important as that of the heroine herself.

When double titles exist for a drama, it may be that the name derived from the protagonist was sometimes the one given by Sophocles and that the chorus-name was invented by the later grammarians.<sup>1</sup> In the cases of the *Atrous* or the *Mycenaean Women* and of the *Minos* or *Καμικοί*, however, I have already suggested another reason for the second appellation. The title *Νίπτρα*, which is usually believed to be a secondary name for the *Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ*, refers not to the chorus, but to an episode, the bath. Whether it describes, according to the theory of Wilamowitz,<sup>2</sup> Sophocles' use of the original Homeric recognition of Odysseus in a bath, or, according to the more usual theory, a later and similar recognition, or whether it describes the bathing of his wounded foot,<sup>3</sup> it would seem that the title was not Sophoclean but became current among the grammarians simply because *Νίπτρα* was the catch-word for the Homeric *ἀναγνώρισις* by the nurse and might be extended to include any bathing of the hero.

#### IV

Certain other factors that I have pointed out in my former article as bearing upon Sophocles' principal interest, the delineation of character, are corroborated by an examination of the existing data on the lost dramas. He studies his secondary characters as carefully as his protagonists.<sup>4</sup> So, even though *Electra* was probably the protagonist of the *Aletes*, the character from whom the play takes its name was apparently given a very definite individuality.<sup>5</sup> On the assumption that Petersen's reconstruction of the *Andromeda* is correct,<sup>6</sup> the other

<sup>1</sup> Pearson (I, p. xviii) takes the opposite view on the ground that Sophocles was prone to follow the precedent of Aeschylus in this matter; but this assumption seems to me gratuitous.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. below, p. 60.

<sup>3</sup> This theory of J. N. Svoronos, that the *Νίπτρα* refers to Telegonus' washing of his father's wounded foot after the recognition, seems to me as far-fetched as the rest of this part of his article in the *Gazette Archéologique*, XIII (1888), pp. 270 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. my article, pp. 78-79.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. above, p. 21.

<sup>6</sup> *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXIV (1904), pp. 106 ff.

sutor, Phineus, was delineated as an "effeminate oriental" in contrast to Perseus. If Thyestes was only the deuteragonist of the *Atreus* or *Mycenaean Women*, fragment 140<sup>1</sup> seems to indicate at least that his character was given a definite stamp, since he is apparently depicted here as a weakling like his son Aegisthus. Telephus was probably what would be technically called the protagonist of the *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος*; but Achilles, with a rôle of not much less importance, was himself represented as embittered. His active and unreflecting nature was also contrasted with the deliberation and craftiness of Odysseus.<sup>2</sup> Odysseus was likewise prominent in the *Σύνδαιπνοι*, applying his wiles to winning over Achilles from his fit of sulking. The lugging of Odysseus into the *Teucer* is additional proof of the fact that this character was a kind of obsession with Sophocles and that he introduced him into situations where other dramatists would never have thought of placing him. It is from Aristotle that we derive the knowledge that Odysseus in the *Teucer* indulged in clever argument.<sup>3</sup> In the same play Telamon appears to have been depicted as an irritable old man.<sup>4</sup> If we accept the version of the *Oenomaus* that makes the charioteer Myrtilus a lover of Hippodamia, then he too was much more than a puppet in the action. Fragment 658<sup>5</sup> of the first *Tyro* indicates that the step-mother Sidero was outlined as possessing the fierceness of the steel (*σίδηρος*) "whose name she bears."

I have also said that Sophocles had a profound interest in the feminine as well as in the masculine character and that he introduced upon the Attic stage the type of the heroic maiden.<sup>6</sup> In the *Polyxena* he probably created a protagonist worthy to be classed with his Antigone and Electra. The scholiast on the beginning of the *Hecuba* of Euripides declares that *τὰ περὶ Πολυξένην ἔστιν εὐρεῖν παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Πολυξένη*; if this statement is pressed to its full meaning, we should expect to find in the heroine of Sophocles the same pride of race and scornful bravery that distinguish Polyxena in the *Hecuba*. Our scanty knowledge of the character of Iphigenia in Sophocles' play of the same name does not permit a decision as to whether she was delineated with any of the heroic patriotism of Euripides' Iphigenia at Aulis.

<sup>1</sup> N. 136.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. fr. 142. Not in Nauck.

<sup>3</sup> *Rhet.*, 3, 15, 1416b2.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. above, p. 11.

<sup>5</sup> N. 597.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. my article, pp. 97-98.



If we may base any conclusions upon the reconstruction postulated for the *Aletes*, Electra in that play continued to exhibit the bold magnanimity that brings her into such strong relief in the surviving tragedy. Other characters in the lost plays were evidently as careful studies of the feminine temperament as the Chrysothemis, Ismene, and Tecmessa of the extant dramas. Whether or not Hermione was the protagonist of the play called after her, it is likely that Sophocles stressed her constancy to her first love, Orestes. Auge, in the *Mysians*, must have been another example of faithfulness to an early passion, if one is willing to accept Sophocles as the source of Hyginus' account.<sup>1</sup> The Medea who dictated to Jason his procedure in the *Κολχίδες*, who with fiendish strategy compassed the destruction of Pelias in the *Πιζορόμοι*, and who in the *Aegeus* tyrannized the old man into persecution of the young Theseus, was the commanding type of woman embodied, in a virtuous form, in Electra and Antigone. A scholium on Apollonius Rhodius<sup>2</sup> actually states that in the *Κολχίδες* Medea advised Jason. As the harshness of Electra and Antigone was softened by alleviating traits, so the vengeful savagery of Procne in the *Tereus* was partially relieved by that love and homesickness for Hellas, in contrast to barbaric Thrace, which breathes through several of the fragments.<sup>3</sup> Some of Sophocles' women were distraught by the complication of motives traditionally ascribed to the feminine sex and illustrated, in the surviving dramas, by the Clytaemnestra of the *Electra*. The complication of motives is often occasioned by the abnormal situations in which the feminine figures are placed. Pearson himself<sup>4</sup> points out that "the chief interest" of the *Lemnian Women* "must have been the opportunity which it offered for delineating (in Hypsipyle) the character of a woman confronted with such exceptional difficulties."<sup>5</sup> Likewise, Althaea in the *Meleager* was perhaps conceived as torn between maternal and fraternal affection; and if, as has been suggested,<sup>6</sup> the development followed Homer closely, Meleager's wife Cleopatra must have been sketched with traits lovely enough to have finally aroused the dormant affection and compassion of her husband. In Tyro, Sophocles presented a

<sup>1</sup> Cf. above, p. 17, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> 3, 1040.

<sup>3</sup> 583 (N. 524); 584 (N. 525); 587 (N. 528).

<sup>4</sup> II, p. 53.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. above, p. 4.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. above, p. 35.

woman who, on the one hand, having been guilty of a *liaison* with Poseidon, had exposed her own children, and who, on the other hand, had to be treated as a pitiful but unbending victim of a stepmother's cruelty, possessed by the desire to retaliate upon her persecutor. It is possible that Phaedra also was imagined by Sophocles as fundamentally virtuous but swayed by an unfortunate passion.

His intense concern with feminine character led to a more pronounced emphasis upon the erotic *motif* than the severer Aeschylus allowed himself. We should expect such an emphasis from the poet who wrote the celebrated stasimon of the *Antigone* beginning "Ἐρως ἀνίκαιε μάχαν and the ardent lines on the might of Cypris that constitute one of the most beautiful fragments<sup>1</sup> quoted by Stobaeus (without the title of the drama to which they belong). The decision as to whether Sophocles was the first to make the erotic *motif* principal on the stage<sup>2</sup> depends partly upon the comparative dates assigned to his *Phaedra* and the two plays of Euripides that treated the same subject;<sup>3</sup> in any case the fact remains that lust was the dominating theme of this tragedy. The passion of Medea for Jason must have been a very significant part of the *Colchian Women*: Welcker<sup>4</sup> and Pearson<sup>5</sup> both deduce that fragment 345<sup>6</sup> came from a passage describing the power of love. The *amour* of Hypsipyle and the same hero constituted a vital interest of the *Lemnian Women*. Fragment 474<sup>7</sup> shows that in the *Oenomaus* the love of Hippodamia for Pelops was emphasized, although one version of the myth had neglected this detail altogether. Possibly the rival passion of Myrtilus for Hippodamia<sup>8</sup> was also introduced. The whole tale of Cephalus and Procris, dramatized by Sophocles in a play called after the latter, turns upon love and jealousy. The *Phoenix* comprised a similar story of passion and vengeance, if it treated the same material as the Euripidean play of identical title. In view of all these amorous intrigues, it seems curious at first thought that Sophocles in the *Meleager* probably made

<sup>1</sup> Pearson, 941; N. 855. Although Stobaeus names Sophocles as the author, Nauck and others assign this fragment rather to Euripides.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. my article, p. 97.

<sup>5</sup> II, pp. 15 and 22.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Pearson, II, p. 296.

<sup>6</sup> N. 320.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 334.

<sup>7</sup> N. 433.

<sup>8</sup> For the arguments pro and con, cf. Pearson, II, p. 123.

little or nothing of the hero's fancy for Atalanta, leaving that aspect of the myth to Euripides. The restriction of the action to Meleager's withdrawal from participation in the war would leave small room for emphasis upon this erotic *motif*. Perhaps Sophocles was here actuated by his usual desire for a greater simplicity than Euripides.

The lost plays contained instances of another type that Sophocles popularized in the theatre, the noble-minded and ingenuous youth. I have analyzed in my former article the character of Neoptolemus in the *Philoctetes* and have pointed out Sophocles' fondness for this creation of his. He introduced him into several other tragedies and endowed him usually with the same generous nature. In the *Scyrians*,<sup>1</sup> Neoptolemus voices that love for his father which constitutes one of the principal motives of his action in the *Philoctetes*; in the *Peleus* he protects his persecuted grandfather and perhaps spares his enemy, Acastus; Plutarch<sup>2</sup> quotes words to show that, when he attacks his adversary in the *Eurypylus*, he abstains from military braggadocio and tongue battles. In the *Hermione* Neoptolemus could scarcely have been represented any longer as a youth. There is nothing to show whether Sophocles lent him any of the nobility that he still possesses in the Euripidean *Andromache*; in any case, if he was the protagonist, he suffered from the tragic defect of a headstrong temper. Perhaps the Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος included the same contrast between Achilles and Odysseus as between Neoptolemus and the wily Ithacan in the *Philoctetes*. Welcker<sup>3</sup> suggests that the *Iphigenia* embodied exactly this contrast, Achilles assuming the rôle of an ingenuous youth cajoled into the scheme of the marriage through the false representations of the case by Odysseus, and at the critical moment refusing to carry the deceit farther. The German scholar was perhaps arguing from the analogy of the Achilles of the Euripidean *Iphigenia at Aulis*. Fragment 307<sup>4</sup> may be an address of Odysseus to Achilles, exhorting him to practise the tricky changefulness of the

<sup>1</sup> Fr. 557; N. 513. The statement in regard to Neoptolemus' expression of love for his father rests upon the justifiable assumption that the *Scyrians* treated the departure of Neoptolemus, not of Achilles, from Scyros.

<sup>2</sup> *De cohibenda ira*, 10, p. 458 E. Plutarch's quotation is now seen to apply to the *Eurypylus*, because certain words in it can be identified in the new papyrus fragment (P100), fr. 210).

<sup>3</sup> See p. 108.

<sup>4</sup> N. 286.

polypus. Since Plutarch praises Eurypylus as well as Neoptolemus for modesty, it is likely that he too was depicted as a noble youth; at least in the new papyrus fragment <sup>1</sup> he is highly extolled by Priam for his prowess and even for wisdom beyond his years.

In three of these plays, the *Scyrians*, the *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος*, and the *Iphigenia*, the character of the upright young man was probably brought into stronger relief by contrast with the craft of the worldly Odysseus. The dramatist apparently introduced a similar juxtaposition into the *Σύνδειπνοι*. The surviving tragedies contain several unmistakable instances of definition of character by contrast. One or two examples in the non-extant tragedies may be added to those already enumerated in order to illustrate more fully this aspect of the art of Sophocles. If Petersen is to be trusted, the manliness of the Perseus of the *Andromeda* was set over against the effeminacy of Phineus. The *Tereus* would have afforded Sophocles an opportunity for a pair of opposites, like Antigone and Ismene or Electra and Chrysothemis: it is hardly possible that he should have neglected to differentiate a strong-minded Procne, intent upon requital, from a weaker and less heroic Philomela, who had been unable to elude the lustful violence of her brother-in-law and was perhaps at first as unwilling as Ismene or Chrysothemis to coöperate with her sister in a plan for vengeance.<sup>2</sup>

The interest in human character contributed, with other influences, to lower the plays of Sophocles from the supernatural plane on which those of Aeschylus so often took place.<sup>3</sup> He did not usually treat myths that required the presence of the gods as actors. The most notable exception was the *Triptolemus*, in which Demeter was introduced instructing the Eleusinian hero;<sup>4</sup> but this was a very early work,<sup>5</sup> strongly influenced by Aeschylus both in diction <sup>6</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> Pearson, *Eurypylus*, fr. 210, lines 70 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The fact that in fr. 589 (N. 530) both sisters are coupled in the blame does not, of course, imply that Procne was not the leading spirit in the gruesome enterprise. Even Chrysothemis is persuaded by Electra to coöperate so far as not to be the instrument of Clytaemnestra's expiatory offering.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. my article on Sophocles, pp. 108-110.

<sup>4</sup> Dionys. Hal., *Ant. Rom.*, I, 12.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Pearson, II, p. 239.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. frs. 597 and 598 (N. 540 and 541).

fondness for *le merveilleux*.<sup>1</sup> Other possible exceptions to the Sophoclean practice were the *Inachus*, which gave rôles to Hermes and Iris, and the *Tantalus*, in which Hermes may have been sent as a messenger to the protagonist. Wilamowitz<sup>2</sup> guesses at the date of about 421 for the *Inachus*, but there are other Aeschylean characteristics, besides the divine intervention, that would suggest a much earlier moment in Sophocles' career. The taste for the supernatural and the exotic was embodied in the description of Io's transformation;<sup>3</sup> and Aeschylus' love of geographical passages<sup>4</sup> appears in fragment 271,<sup>5</sup> as it had likewise found a place in the account of the journey of Triptolemus over the earth in the drama named after him.<sup>6</sup> Many scholars, however, have thought that the *Inachus* was a satyr-play. If this surmise is correct, it would obey the canons of another dramatic *genre*, which we have excluded from our present survey, and the question of the presence of divine actors would not concern us.

The employment of the *deus ex machina* is quite a different matter from the appearance of gods as participants in the main action; but even this Euripidean device does not seem often to have been adopted by Sophocles. The example from the *Philoctetes*, among the extant tragedies, I have discussed in another place.<sup>7</sup> The most probable instance in the lost tragedies is perhaps afforded by the Thetis of the *Σύνδαιπνοι*;<sup>8</sup> and it is significant that she appears in the same guise in the *Andromache* of Euripides. The similarity in moral problem and development between the *Philoctetes* and the *Σύνδαιπνοι* would suggest that the latter play also belonged to the old age of Sophocles, and the introduction of the *θεὰ ἀπὸ μηχανῆς*, as a Euripidean mannerism, would point in the same direction. Thetis may also have manifested herself at the end of the *Peleus* to settle the strife between the protagonist and Acastus, if Pearson<sup>9</sup> is right in supposing that the ac-

<sup>1</sup> Triptolemus, for instance, travelled over the earth in a car drawn by winged serpents (cf. Pearson, II, p. 240).

<sup>2</sup> U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Einleitung in die attische Tragödie*, Berlin, 1889, p. 88, n. 53.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Pearson, I, p. 199.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. my essay on the *Dramatic Art of Aeschylus*, pp. 58-59.

<sup>5</sup> N. 249.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. above, p. 19.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Pearson, II, p. 240.

<sup>9</sup> II, p. 142.

<sup>7</sup> *The Dramatic Art of Sophocles*, p. 110.

count of Dictys is based in this detail upon Sophocles. Since Aristophanes in the *Knights*<sup>1</sup> of 424 B.C. quotes from the *Peleus*, it was brought out long before the *Σύνδειπνοι*; another play of this earlier period, the *Teucer*, quoted by Aristophanes in the *Clouds* of 423,<sup>2</sup> possibly introduced Apollo at the end, ordering the emigration of the hero to the island of Cyprus.<sup>3</sup> The *Tyro*, in which Engelmann<sup>4</sup> has conjectured that Poseidon was a god from the machine, has been placed in the years from 420 to 415,<sup>5</sup> and so brings us again to a period when the influence of Euripides was more likely. A section of the mutilated new papyrus fragment that has been assigned to the *Tyro*, since it seems to embody a prayer invoking the appearance of the god of the sea,<sup>6</sup> would corroborate Engelmann's theory. There is a possibility that the *Aletes*, which is frequently considered a very late work,<sup>7</sup> included a theophany of Artemis: when Hyginus, at the end of his fable,<sup>8</sup> states that this goddess saved Erigone, the sister of Aletes, from the hands of Orestes and made her a priestess in Attica, he is perhaps reflecting Sophocles, who may even have used the tale, like Euripides in the *Tauric Iphigenia*, as an aetiological explanation of an Attic cult. If any chronological significance is to be given to the fact that, of a series of plays on the same myth, one treats the concluding phases of the story, then the *Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ*, as the final member of the series upon Odysseus,<sup>9</sup> may supply another instance of a late tragedy with a culminating theophany, in this case, of Athena.<sup>10</sup> The *Niobe* cannot be definitely dated;<sup>11</sup> but it almost demands some supernatural being at the end, whether Tantalus or another,<sup>12</sup> to announce to the audience the transportation of the protagonist to Lydia. Welcker<sup>13</sup> guesses, with no real evidence, that in the

<sup>1</sup> Line 1099.<sup>2</sup> Cf. above, p. 11.<sup>3</sup> Cf. Pearson, II, pp. 216-217.<sup>4</sup> R. Engelmann, *Archäologische Studien zu den Tragikern*, Berlin, 1900, p. 46.<sup>5</sup> Cf. above, p. 40.<sup>7</sup> Cf. Pearson, I, p. 62.<sup>6</sup> Pearson, fr. 649, lines 52 ff.<sup>8</sup> 122.<sup>9</sup> The *Nausicaa*, which treated an earlier episode in the life of Odysseus, was certainly a work of Sophocles' youth.<sup>10</sup> Pearson, II, pp. 107 and 110.<sup>11</sup> Unless we believe that the death of the daughters of Niobe on the stage (cf. below, p. 58) can be considered, as in the *Ajax*, evidence of an early date when Sophocles had a youthful enthusiasm for innovations.<sup>12</sup> Cf. above, p. 37, n. 1.<sup>13</sup> See p. 413.

*Aleadae* Heracles finally declared the real birth of Telephus, and directed him to seek in Mysia purification from his uncles' murder; but this *dénouement* would have involved a more unjustifiable employment of the *deus ex machina* to extricate the entanglement than even Euripides usually allowed himself, and one prefers to believe that the author of the superb plot of the *Oedipus King* found some such more natural solution as that suggested by Wernicke,<sup>1</sup> — a forced explanation by the protector of Telephus, King Corythus.

There remains a final question in regard to Sophocles' delineation of character, which the examination of all his plays enables us to answer more definitely than if we had only the surviving works as a basis for judgment. When he introduced the same person in two or more dramas, did he cast him in all cases in the same mold? The proper conclusion seems to be, that in the great majority of instances he did not alter his conception of a character, and that, when he did make a change, it was dictated by the exigencies of the plot. This conclusion is borne out, first, by the extant tragedies. The similar traits revealed by Odysseus in the *Ajax* and *Philoctetes* I have discussed in my former article.<sup>2</sup> The Antigone of the *Oedipus Coloneus* has suffered no change, but merely finds herself in circumstances that do not call for so heroic a mood as she exhibits in the tragedy that bears her name. The Oedipus of the *Coloneus* is the same man as the Oedipus of the *Tyrannus*, somewhat broken in spirit but not completely chastened or purified until the end.<sup>3</sup> In the case of none of the purificatory sequences, indeed, can the fact of an ultimate purification be interpreted as an alteration in the conception of a character; the purified protagonist is essentially the same character in another phase of his career. Ismene in the *Oedipus Coloneus* does seem to possess a more attractive personality than in the *Antigone*, although even in the later play she has allowed her stronger sister to assume the burden of sharing the father's long wanderings and afflictions; but a more pronounced instance of an altered character is afforded by Creon, who is a different person in each of three dramas from the Theban legend.

The lost tragedies provide a number of cases for examination. It has already been seen that in several other plays, with the possible

<sup>1</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, II, 2302.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 92 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. my article, pp. 105 ff.

exception of the *Hermione*, Neoptolemus revealed the same charm with which Sophocles invested him in the *Philoctetes*.<sup>1</sup> Pearson,<sup>2</sup> for instance, notes that the love which he manifests for his father in the *Philoctetes* is reëchoed in fragment 557<sup>3</sup> of the *Scyrians*. But Sophocles was perhaps even more fascinated by the diametrically opposed personality of Odysseus, and exerted more effort upon his delineation. I have pointed out at the beginning that he arbitrarily introduced Odysseus into the *Iphigenia* and the *Teucer*. If Jebb is right in assigning fragment 307<sup>4</sup> of the *Iphigenia* to Odysseus, we have here a typical speech of the Ithacan schemer in the advice (to whomever addressed) to adopt the shifting policy of the octopus. Aristotle<sup>5</sup> comments upon the specious argument used by Odysseus in the *Teucer*. In the *Scyrians* his adroitness may have been pitted against the simplicity of Neoptolemus as in the *Philoctetes*. Even if we adopt Brunck's view<sup>6</sup> that the *Scyrians* was concerned with the hiding of the young Achilles at Scyros, Odysseus would have had an almost identical rôle to act; and the anonymous fragment<sup>7</sup> that Brunck ascribes to the *Scyrians* of Sophocles introduces Odysseus reproaching Achilles for dishonoring his lineage by lurking behind as an *embusqué*. In the *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος* and the *Σύνδαιπνοι* it was certainly Achilles who constituted the foil to his seasoned sagacity. Fragments 564 and 566<sup>8</sup> of the latter work appear to be drawn from passages in which Odysseus ingeniously taunted Achilles with cowardice in order to goad him into resuming his place in the expeditionary forces. The very title of the *Palamedes* indicates that this play represented the darker side of Odysseus' cleverness in his betrayal of the protagonist, no matter what view is taken of the Sophoclean details of his treachery. There can be little doubt that we should assign to the *Laconian Women* the fragment, quoted by Herodian from Sophocles without the title of the drama,<sup>9</sup> in which Odysseus derides Diomedes; and on this basis we shall be obliged to believe that Sophocles unnecessarily introduced

<sup>1</sup> Cf. above, p. 50.

<sup>2</sup> II, p. 192, n. 7.

<sup>3</sup> N. 513.

<sup>4</sup> N. 286. Cf. above, p. 50.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. above, p. 47, n. 3.

<sup>6</sup> R. F. P. Brunck, Ed. of seven plays with fragments, Strassburg, 1788, vol. III, pp. 444-445.

<sup>7</sup> N., fr. adesp. 9. This fragment probably comes rather from the *Scyrians* of Euripides.

<sup>8</sup> N. 139 and 141.

<sup>9</sup> Pearson, fr. 799; N. 731.



the episode of the quarrel of the two champions, merely for the purpose of exhibiting Odysseus in the unattractive light of a man who wishes by chicanery to rob his comrade of the honor of sharing in the capture of the Palladium. If Sophocles followed the version of the episode that told of Diomedes using the flat of his sword to drive Odysseus into the Greek camp as his prisoner, the Ithacan would have been represented as stained with something of that cowardice and bathos which are ascribed to him in the *Ajax* and *Philoctetes*.<sup>1</sup> Even if the lines do not come from the *Laconian Women*, the fact would remain that in some other tragedy Odysseus was conceived in his usual character of a wrangler. In another Sophoclean fragment<sup>2</sup> that cannot be assigned to a definite play, he is dubbed a *πάνσοφον κρότημα*, and it makes little difference whether the uncomplimentary epithet be interpreted as a bundle of deceit or a "chatterbox." Of the dramas in which he was the chief personage, the *Ὀδυσσεὺς μαινόμενος* must have shown him as the customary trickster.<sup>3</sup> There is nothing to indicate how he was delineated in the *Euryalus*; but it is probable that in the *Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ* he was modelled on nobler lines. Likewise, it is hardly possible that in the *Nausicaa* he should not have been a simpler, kindlier, and more romantic figure; perhaps Sophocles, at this early moment in his career, had not yet evolved his conception of Odysseus as an exponent of worldly wisdom and of the theory that the end justifies the means.

Of other personages who appeared in the extant as well as the lost tragedies, Electra of the *Aletes* continued to exhibit the same heroic will and fixed purpose of retaliation, if the reconstruction that has been outlined above<sup>4</sup> is valid. Fragment 101, which has already been quoted, would be a statement of the unswerving rectitude of her course. Teucer, in the play of which he was the protagonist, seems to have stuck to his determination to remain at Salamis with the same tenacity with which he had loyally defended his brother in the *Ajax*. He still retained the ability in disputation that he had shown against Menelaus and Agamemnon, for Aristotle, in the passage from the *Rhetoric* that has already been mentioned,<sup>5</sup> refers specifically to the arguments advanced by Teucer against the contention of Odysseus.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my article, pp. 93-94.

<sup>2</sup> Pearson, 913; N. 827.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. above, p. 29.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 19-21.

<sup>5</sup> P. 47.

In the tragedies dealing with the sordid myth of Atreus and Thyestes, whether we consider their number to have been two or three,<sup>1</sup> the two brothers must have vied with each other throughout in hideous cunning. The banquet-play and the Sicyon-play probably depicted Thyestes as spitefully coveting the sceptre of Mycenae, and both may have shown him also as a libertine. The sinister arts employed by Medea in the *Colchian Women* to safeguard Jason were not different from those to which she resorted in the *Aegeus* for the purpose of destroying Theseus. If she brewed the poison in the *Aegeus*, she must have had the same character of a witch as in the *Root-gatherers*. Sophocles seems to have followed Homer and Aeschylus in representing Helen as repentant at Troy, or perhaps even as an innocent victim of abduction by Paris.<sup>2</sup> It is hard to escape the conclusion that in fragment 178<sup>3</sup> of the 'Ελένης ἀπαίτησις she prefers suicide to remaining at Troy and facing the reputation of a wanton. In the *Laconian Women* she probably connived with Odysseus and Diomedes in the theft of the Palladium.<sup>4</sup> Sufficient evidence does not exist for determining whether in the same play Antenor, the pacifist of the 'Ελένης ἀπαίτησις, had developed into a traitor to his country.<sup>5</sup> If Nauplius appeared at Troy at the end of the *Palamedes* to vindicate his son's memory and to avenge his death,<sup>6</sup> his rôle was the same as in the *Ναύπλιος πυρκαεύς*, which represented him as punishing his son's judges by luring them to ruin on the rocks through false signals of fire. *Ναύπλιος καταπλέων* may have been an alternative title for the *πυρκαεύς*; otherwise, it seems more logical with Pearson<sup>7</sup> to suppose that it treated another of the father's infernal plans of retaliation, his corruption and destruction of the family of Idomeneus.

## V

In the fourth section of my former article I have sought to analyze certain phases of Sophocles' technique that are not so closely connected with his study of character. It was partially, however, his desire to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. above, pp. 23-25.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Welcker, pp. 119 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Nauck places this fragment among those that he cannot assign definitely to any play, giving it the number 663, but he states that it seems to belong to the 'Ελένης ἀπαίτησις.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Pearson, II, p. 35.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, II, pp. 132-133.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, II, pp. 34-35.

<sup>7</sup> II, p. 82 and p. 86 under fr. 431.

have a greater stretch of time in which his personages could display the several aspects of their temperaments that caused him to begin his tragedies at earlier moments in the myths than Aeschylus. One or two instances may be discerned in the lost plays. In addition to the witness of Aristophanes in line 911 of the *Frogs*, there is abundant evidence<sup>1</sup> that the *Niobe* of Aeschylus began with the representation of the mother silently grieving for her dead children. A corrupt passage in the eighteenth chapter of Aristotle's *Poetics*<sup>2</sup> is perhaps best emended<sup>3</sup> to mean that Euripides rightly refrained from dramatizing the whole story of the fall of Troy and that Aeschylus rightly confined himself to a section of the myth of Niobe; but, however the words are read, they imply at least that in some play or plays Aeschylus brought on the stage only a part of the available material. Plutarch<sup>4</sup> categorically states that the action of the *Niobe* of Sophocles included the death of the sons; and whether the passage be interpreted in the sense that their destruction was performed before the audience, as in the *Ajax*,<sup>5</sup> or in the sense that it was reported by a messenger, the fact remains that in the Aeschylean version they and the daughters had already been killed and the tragedy opened with Niobe mourning at their tomb. Welcker<sup>6</sup> conjectured that in the Sophoclean version the daughters were stricken before the eyes of the audience and that the death of the sons was recounted in a *ῥῆσις*. At least one part of this conjecture appears to be corroborated by certain other papyrus scraps,<sup>7</sup> in addition to that already mentioned as embodying a speech of Tantalus.<sup>8</sup> The fragmentary lines suit no other tragedy so well as the *Niobe* of Sophocles, and in one passage a maiden seems to be dying from the sudden visitation of Artemis. There is no play of Aeschylus with which to compare the *Polyxena*, but this work com-

<sup>1</sup> For a recapitulation of the evidence, see Nauck, introduction to the fragments of the *Niobe* of Aeschylus.

<sup>2</sup> 1456a17.

<sup>3</sup> By Vahlen.

<sup>4</sup> *Amat.*, 17, p. 760 E.

<sup>5</sup> Of course, both in the *Ajax* and the *Niobe* the actors may at the last moment have withdrawn from the view of the spectators, in order to keep the letter of the custom that looked askance upon the ritualistic pollution of the shrine of Dionysus through the visible representation of the final agony; but the effect in both cases would be very much the same as when in our theatre the person actually expires upon the stage.

<sup>6</sup> Pp. 290 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Pearson, frs. 442-445.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. above, p. 36.

prised a more extended action than the older poet would have permitted himself in treating the same material. The main theme was the sacrifice of the Trojan princess to appease the spirit of Achilles; but Strabo<sup>1</sup> informs us that the drama included also the quarrel of Agamemnon and Menelaus upon the question of departing at once for home or delaying at Troy to propitiate Athena. Mythical tradition represented Agamemnon as remaining after the dispute and as directed by the ghost of Achilles to sacrifice Polyxena, so that in the Sophoclean tragedy the strife of the two brothers preceded the episode of the immolation. With two almost separate *motifs* of this kind, the play must have broken in two at the middle like the *Ajax*, and must have been as seriously lacking in unity. The Aeschylean tone of fragments 526 and 527<sup>2</sup> suggests that the *Polyxena* belonged to the same early period as the *Ajax*, when Sophocles had not yet fully mastered dramatic technique; it must have been produced at least before 423 B.C., if Welcker is right in attributing to this play fragment 887,<sup>3</sup> which, according to a scholiast, Aristophanes parodied in line 1163 of the *Clouds*.<sup>4</sup> Since there is good reason for believing that the start of the chariot-race was included in the action of the *Oenomaus*,<sup>5</sup> it may be that Sophocles here again began early in the story.

I have not been able to discover in the fragments any indubitable examples of the substitution of word-pictures for our modern elaborate stage-setting.<sup>6</sup> Certain passages, however, appear to embody an Aeschylean predilection for geographical descriptions.<sup>7</sup> I have already referred<sup>8</sup> to fragment 271 of the *Inachus* in which Sophocles outlines the course of the river Inachus, and to the account of the journey of Triptolemus in the play named after him. Fragment 24, whether assigned to the *Aegeus* or not,<sup>9</sup> comprises Sophocles' description of the division of Attica among the sons of Pandion. The *Triptolemus*

<sup>1</sup> 470.      <sup>2</sup> N. 483 and 484. Cf. also Pearson's comment upon these fragments.

<sup>3</sup> N. 801.

<sup>4</sup> Unless we suppose that the line belongs to the later revision of the *Clouds* or that the scholiast wrongly discerned a parody of Sophocles.

<sup>5</sup> For the evidence, see Pearson, II, p. 125.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. my article, pp. 117-118.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. my essay on the *Dramatic Art of Aeschylus*, pp. 58-59; also, Gilbert Norwood, *Greek Tragedy*, Boston, 1920, p. 119.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. above, p. 52.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. above, p. 13.

was certainly an early work of the poet when he was still very much under the influence of Aeschylus; the *Inachus* may very well belong to the same period.<sup>1</sup> Even the *Aegeus* might be ascribed to this date, if we take as a criterion the consideration that the tests of the will may have been arranged as in the *Ajax* and *Antigone*.<sup>2</sup>

The narration of the journey of Triptolemus served another purpose of Sophocles, the desire "to set his play against a broader background of space and time" than was included in the action itself.<sup>3</sup> Also in the *Aegeus*, the description of the adventures of Theseus in coming from Troezen to Athens,<sup>4</sup> like the enumeration of the labors of Heracles in the *Trachiniae*, would have widened the vista of the spectator. After much the same fashion, Odysseus, in the *ἀκανθοπλήξ*, seems almost certainly to have told the story of his wanderings from Troy to Ithaca.<sup>5</sup> This circumstance provides another case in which an examination of one of the elements in the dramatic art of Sophocles aids in the problem of the reconstruction of a lost play. Wilamowitz<sup>6</sup> supposes that the *ἀκανθοπλήξ* embodied the first return of Odysseus and that Sophocles adopted a version of the return different from that of the *Odyssey*. One of Wilamowitz' arguments is that Odysseus in a second return would not have indulged in a recapitulation of the account of his trials that he must have given when he first came back. But since it can be proved that it was a regular custom of Sophocles to introduce such passages in order to broaden the horizon of a tragedy, even when they are not integral parts of the development, the presence of Odysseus' tale is not in itself<sup>7</sup> sufficient evidence for rejecting the version that represented Odysseus as returning from a second journey. It is not necessary, indeed, to suppose that the reminiscences of Odysseus occupied many lines in the *ἀκανθοπλήξ*. We shall perhaps be right in falling back upon the opinion of the old German scholar, Welcker,<sup>8</sup> who conjectures that Odysseus at his second home-coming

<sup>1</sup> Cf. above, p. 52.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. my article on Sophocles, p. 122.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. above, p. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Pearson, I, p. 15.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Pearson, II, pp. 108-109, and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Homerische Untersuchungen*, Berlin, 1884, p. 196.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 194 ff.

<sup>7</sup> A more serious difficulty is the necessity of assuming at the second return a recognition in a bath similar to that related in the *Odyssey*.

<sup>8</sup> See p. 247.

confined himself to a short exposition of his vicissitudes. Reference has already been made to the fact that in the *Teucer*<sup>1</sup> the outlook is broadened by the introduction of the secondary *motif* of the Locrian Ajax. I have also suggested that the spectator's vision is enlarged by the position of a play in a purificatory sequence.<sup>2</sup>

Of humorous relief,<sup>3</sup> the fragments of the lost dramas do not provide many examples. The most curious instance is the passage<sup>4</sup> from the *Σύνδειπνοι*, which, in comic and piquant phraseology, describes some one (Thersites?) as hit by a chamber-pot. The "coarseness" of the lines has suggested to some critics that the *Σύνδειπνοι* was a satyr-play or a tragi-comedy like the *Alcestis*. But the vulgarity is no more pronounced than in the nurse's speech of the *Choephori*; and it is significant that in this fragment of the *Σύνδειπνοι* Sophocles almost plagiarized a passage<sup>5</sup> from Aeschylus' *Ὀστολόγοι*,<sup>6</sup> which, however, has also been suspected of being a satyr-play. The colloquial character of certain fragments<sup>7</sup> of the *Inachus* has been noted by some scholars, but here again there arises the question of a satyr-play or of an analogy to the *Alcestis*. If Odysseus was beaten into the Greek camp with the flat of Diomedes' sword in the *Laconian Women*,<sup>8</sup> he would have presented the same spectacle of humorous cowardice as at the beginning of the *Ajax*.<sup>9</sup>

## VI

One of the objects of this article has been to show that it is not necessary to base our modern estimate of such an author as Sophocles solely upon the extant works. Despite the fact that the material for the investigation of the plays that have perished is unusually meagre in the case of Sophocles, I have endeavored to demonstrate the existence, in these plays, of certain aspects of the master's art that are apparent in the surviving dramas and to suggest new points of view that emerge only from a comprehensive consideration of his whole output. The phases of his method that may most convincingly be

<sup>1</sup> Cf. above, p. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Fr. 565; N. 140.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. above, p. 11.

<sup>5</sup> N. 180.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. my article, pp. 121-122.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Pearson, II, pp. 200-201 and the comment under fr. 565.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. especially fr. 277 (N. 255).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. above, p. 56.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. my article, p. 121.

verified in the lost as well as in the extant tragedies are: his adaptation of the mythical deposit to his purpose of emphasis upon the delineation of character or to his ideal of simplicity; his construction of a drama upon the basis of the tragic sin and of a series of episodes that test, punish, and purify the will; his habit of naming a play after the strong-willed protagonist; the various aspects of his study of human personality; and certain technical devices, such as humorous relief, the setting of the commencement of his plays at an earlier moment in the myth than Aeschylus, and the widening of the vista beyond the limits of the actual subject treated. The principal new points revealed by the additional evidence are the purificatory sequence, the recurrent use of plots similar to those that he had manipulated before, a more frequent introduction of the *deus ex machina* than would be suggested by the example of the *Philoctetes*, and the maintenance of a uniform conception of a given character in several different tragedies. In some instances, when the paltry evidence of the fragments themselves or of the incidental allusions by ancient writers does not justify any conclusions, the reader may feel that it is not right to draw any inferences in regard to the play in question from the general outlines of the myth that Sophocles utilized; but it must be remembered that the very fact that he chose any myth for dramatization indicates that the story in itself contained certain factors which were in accord with his usual modes of procedure and scheme of construction.

The existing evidence on the lost plays affords opportunity for the examination of many other aspects of Sophocles' production besides those discussed in this article. It has already been pointed out that in the *Larissaei*, the *Thyestes at Sicyon*, the *Hermione*, the *Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ*, the *Thamyras*, *Ῥιζοτόμοι*, and *Laocoon*, H. F. Müller might have found confirmation for his theory that a tragic situation is created by the interference of fate to pervert the protagonist's designs. Interesting results could perhaps be obtained, also, from an endeavor to apply to the lost dramas A. R. Chandler's Freudian explanation, in the extant works, of the Aristotelian catharsis of the passions.<sup>1</sup> The satyr-play lies without the province of the present

<sup>1</sup> A. R. Chandler, *Tragic Effect in Sophocles Analyzed According to the Freudian Method*, *The Monist*, XXIII (1913), pp. 59-89.

article; but a fresh investigation of this whole important subject is very much needed, and would furnish a fruitful theme for a doctor's dissertation which took into account not only the newly discovered section of the *Ichneutae* but also such other satyr-plays of Sophocles as the *Cedalion* and the *Pandora*. It is to be desired, furthermore, that, to a greater extent than in the past, Aeschylus and Euripides be judged on the merits of their whole production rather than only by the comparatively few works that have remained to us in their entirety. The figure of Euripides, in particular, would be more clearly defined by such a process. The fragments are copious, and many of the plots may be reconstructed. However much the reputation of Euripides suffers when such plays as the *Hypsipyle* and the *Phaethon* are brought into the prospect, it is surely advisable to utilize every scrap of information at hand in order to arrive at a just valuation of an author who has risen in our own day to a new popularity.